

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, February 17, 2005

8:10 a.m.

Crystal City Hilton
2399 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia

PARTICIPANTS:

Dr. Tundi Agardy
Robert Bendick
David Benton
Dr. Daniel Bromley
Dr. Anthony Chatwin
Dr. Michael Cruickshank
Carol Dinkins
Dr. Rod Fujita
Dr. Delores Garza
Eric Gilman
Dr. John Halsey
Dr. Mark Hixon
George Lapointe
Dr. Bonnie McCay
Mel Moon
Robert Moran
Dr. Steven Murray
Michael Nussman
Terry O'Halloran
Dr. John Ogden
Lelei Peau
Dr. Walter Pereyra
Max Peterson
Gil Radonski
Dr. James Ray
Barbara Stevenson
Dr. Daniel Suman
Captain Thomas (Ted) Thompson
Kay Williams
Robert Zales, II
Mack Gray
Mary Glackin
Donald Schregardus
Patricia Morrison
Margaret Hayes
RADM Jim Underwood
Dr. Brian Melzian
Dr. Joseph R. Pawlik
Jacqueline Schafer
LT. Jeff Rearson
Larry Maloney
Dr. Charles Wahle
Lauren Wenzel
Heidi Recksiek
Lisa Phelps

1

2

P R O C E E D I N G S

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

MR. CHAIRMAN: First thing this morning. And I have just one person signed up to speak, so once that is out of the way, we can turn our attention back to what we did yesterday. But the public comment period is an important part of the activity, whether we have one or twenty. So, let me get people settled here.

10

11

12

13

14

So, near as I can tell, I have just one person registered, Kate Wing from NRDC. Kate, do you want to come up to the microphone, please? And you may have, in an unprecedented show of generosity, you may have six minutes or seven. But don't push us.

15

16

17

MS. WING: Well, hi, my name is Kate Wing. I am with the Natural Resources Defense Council. I work out of our San Francisco office.

18

19

20

21

22

And I am pleased to see the incredible progress that this committee has made since I last spoke before you at your San Mateo meeting. It is quite an impressive document that you guys have put together and I want to commend you for that. It is a

1 lot of work.

2 And I am glad you guys have really stuck to
3 it and produced what we see on the table today. It is
4 a great job.

5 And I am sorry I wasn't here for all the
6 discussions yesterday, where I am sure you have
7 probably resolved a number of my concerns. But just
8 in case they happen to be outstanding, I wanted to
9 mention them today.

10 I come from the land of California, where we
11 have this Marine Life Protection Act. So, we feel
12 sort of like we kind of have this monopoly on the
13 world of MLPA, because we are moving forward with this
14 large process. And I know that is not the case all
15 over the country.

16 And that is part of what your national
17 recommendations are providing, I think, is a kind of
18 national marine life protection act. A set of
19 standards, a set of goals and objectives, a way and a
20 process for people to nominate marine protected areas
21 and make them part of a national system.

22 One thing that I think could be clearer in

1 the document is a little more on how this national
2 system approach, what makes it a system and what makes
3 it different from the inventory we already have, what
4 makes it more of an integrated network, so to speak.
5 Although, I know that there are scientific issues
6 about the word network, but what makes it something
7 that works together as a whole, rather than just a
8 list of sites.

9 After these sites are evaluated, based on the
10 criteria and goals and objectives laid out in the
11 document, what does that mean? Is it just that they
12 might be eligible for more funding? Or is there
13 really something more on top of that?

14 Second, there has been a lot of debate about
15 what to do of fishery management closures, how to deal
16 with fishery management closures. I know you have
17 heard from most of all of the councils.

18 One way that I would propose - you might want
19 to think about that - excuse me, is that if the
20 interest is in marine protected areas that have a
21 certain amount of longevity and a commitment to a
22 longer term process, you may want to look at closures

1 that are created as FMP amendments, rather than simply
2 as annual specifications.

3 The amendment process to FMPs takes much
4 longer, in some cases, five to six years just to amend
5 an FMP to get through that document.

6 And, as part of an FMP amendment, the council
7 could state that there is a commitment to longevity
8 for that closure. They could state in the FMP
9 amendment we intend this to be closed for at least ten
10 years.

11 So, you sort of have two opportunities to
12 make a commitment to a longer closure through the
13 fishery management plan process that would give you
14 sort of that added commitment to protection that I
15 think an MPA definition requires, rather than annual
16 specifications, which simply, just based on what they
17 are, have to be reconsidered every year.

18 And I think that has made many of us a little
19 concerned about calling annual specification closures
20 MPAs. Because they do have to be reconsidered and
21 they can be changed fairly easily, as opposed to an
22 FMP amendment.

1 And, finally, I picked up the proposed
2 changes to the MPA classification system, which I see
3 you have done. And I notice that you have gone from
4 three categories to seven. And then we are back?
5 Wow. So, maybe we should take this off the table. I
6 mean I would - I think that is great that you went
7 there.

8 One thing that has come up in California is
9 that we have just said if you want to nominate your
10 MPA to be considered in multiple areas, you can do
11 that, rather than increasing the classification
12 system. And I think that is great that you have
13 decided to stick with it. Simplify classification
14 system and I don't have any more comments. Thank you
15 again for your excellent work.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Kate. Okay. Are there
17 others? I think Dana indicated that - Dana? That is
18 the only one. Okay. Thank you, Kate, very much.

19 All right.

20 MS. WENZEL: Before we get started, I just
21 wanted to make one announcement. I have been trying
22 to catch up with the American - Museum of the American

1 Indian, given the interest that there was. And it is
2 still not sure whether we would be able to get a
3 guided tour. But they did ask for a show of interest.

4 So, I just wanted to find out how many people would
5 be interested in going over tomorrow morning, if your
6 plans permit?

7 One, two -

8 MR. O'HALLORAN: What would be the time for
9 that?

10 MS. WENZEL: Well, your preference. I mean I
11 would think you would all - I don't think it opens
12 until ten, so that is the earliest.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: So, I see. Terry? Is your
14 hand up or do you have a question?

15 MR. O'HALLORAN: No, I had my hand up to say I
16 might want to go.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: So, I see three.

18 MS. WENZEL: Okay. I will get back to you
19 all. Thanks.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We are redesigning this
21 thing as we fly. It is a process of building our boat
22 under us while we are at sea, if I may use a metaphor

1 from philosophy about where he is at sea and builds
2 his ship as he is there. So, we - we are feeling our
3 way as we go, which is fine.

4 Let me off this as a suggestion. I believe
5 we have three from the mental tasks today. One is to
6 wrap up the work on the flip charts behind me. This
7 thing. Go back through the groups, make sure everyone
8 is here with us.

9 The second is to solicit what I will call
10 editorial suggestions, worries of a finer nature, a
11 minor sort of nature, which is not to discount them,
12 but sort of things that you have noticed in the draft.

13 And we have wondered how best to do that.
14 And you will notice Heidi has put around the wall here
15 some more flip charts.

16 The idea is, could we ask you if you, one
17 page - or on line 307, if you don't quite like some
18 wording, if you would go to these things and make that
19 entry there? It would give us some basis for
20 processing wording suggestions that probably don't
21 warrant great discussion, great debate.

22 Once the - so, we will set aside some time

1 for you to do that. That will be the second thing we
2 do today. And it may be that you will enter something
3 there that you - that you do want to discuss. Maybe
4 others want to resist it. So, we will spend time,
5 once that registration of points has been taken care
6 of, we will have a chance to look at them and consider
7 them.

8 And then I think the third - we thought maybe
9 we would allow thirty minutes for that. And then it
10 seems to me the third thing that we have to worry
11 about today is starting to draft some recommendations.

12 So, those are the three things that I think
13 we need to do between now and 12:30. And if there are
14 no objections to proceeding that way, we will do so.
15 Are there other thoughts about how we might best use
16 this morning? It is okay?

17 All right. I think the point is, we will go
18 to this flip chart. We will go through it one more
19 time to see where each of the groups feels that it is.

20 Have we satisfied the concerns that were raised that
21 the groups addressed?

22 Once that is done, it might be an hour from

1 now, I am not sure. Then we will set aside the thirty
2 minute period, which can be sort of your coffee break
3 and whatever. And then it will give you a chance to
4 do that stuff. And then we will reconvene and work on
5 the recommendations.

6 Yes, Rod?

7 DR. FUJITA: Mr. Chairman, a quick question.
8 I am wondering if we have any more copies of the draft
9 introduction that I handed out yesterday? Perhaps
10 there are members of the public? Okay, I wanted to
11 make sure we got one.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: So, shall we work our way down
13 the list? The - the first task group up there was
14 sort of the why question, which in a sense has become
15 more work on the introduction. Right, Rod? And you
16 are - do we want to assume that this is your final and
17 best offer? And you would like us to -

18 DR. FUJITA: It is the best offer.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: This is our - your best offer?
20 Okay. And now the point is I am going to assume
21 people did not get a chance to read it in the flurry
22 of ending yesterday. So, why don't we give you thirty

1 seconds to read this? I am kidding. Take two
2 minutes, three minutes, whatever. Let's just look at
3 it very carefully.

4 Are you ready to reflect on it a little bit?

5 Do you need a little bit more time? Max? Are you
6 going to make a specific comment, Max?

7 MR. PETERSON: Yes.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

9 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I - it is obvious
10 that some learned people have spent a long time
11 laboring on this thing. So, I hesitate to make
12 comments, but I will make a couple.

13 One is in the third paragraph -

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Wait. Sorry, Max. I am very
15 sorry. I thought you - when you raised your hand, I
16 thought you said you were indicated you needed more
17 time. And then -

18 MR. PETERSON: No.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we turn to specific
20 paragraphs, do you think we could - could we look at
21 it in the large for a minute and then come to more
22 specific stuff? Do you mind if I -

1 MR. PETERSON: I will be glad to do that also.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon me?

3 MR. PETERSON: I will be glad to do that
4 whenever you are ready.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. I would like to, if I
6 may, just - George?

7 MR. LAPOINTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And -

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Wait a minute. I am sorry.
9 Okay. I was going to try to make some context kind of
10 comments before we get to specifics. May I do that?

11 MR. PETERSON: Why don't you go ahead.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

13 MR. PETERSON: Sure.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I - well, no, no, no. I
15 am sorry. But let me see if I can -

16 MR. PETERSON: Go ahead.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, thanks. It seems to me
18 we have now the first four paragraphs or problem
19 statements of different kinds. Okay?

20 The first is public - I just - now you have
21 probably seen these same things. But what I want to
22 ask you to do, before we focus on words or paragraphs

1 or sentences, what is this whole package.

2 All right. Now, I would like to tell you how
3 I see this whole package. And I didn't lie awake last
4 night studying. I just read it like many of you.

5 But what it says to me is the first paragraph
6 is a problem statement, which we felt was
7 insufficiently articulated before. The second
8 paragraph is a problem statement, as I see it, of a
9 different nature.

10 The third paragraph is a problem statement.
11 And the fourth paragraph is a problem statement. Fair
12 enough. I see four problem statements here.

13 The first problem statement back at the top
14 is this political public recognition, which we have
15 kind of recognized yesterday we might want to start
16 with. I think they have done that.

17 The second problem statement - it seems to me
18 the second paragraph is -- there is a story about the
19 incoherence of current management structures or
20 something. Right? So that is sort of a problem.

21 The third is a - I think a little more
22 specific kind of problem statement. And the fourth

1 is, to me, kind of closes the sale on this litany of
2 problems with the current status.

3 Am I right? Is that how you see it? Okay.

4 And then it leads into the benefits of an
5 MPA. We might want to worry about benefits. But then
6 - you know, so there is the statement from the
7 executive order.

8 And then the paragraph right after that -- it
9 would be the first - second full paragraph from the
10 back page, describes what we have done. The next
11 paragraph says what would happen if what we have done
12 were acted upon. And the last one, they have called
13 it a call to action, but it is sort of, okay, now what
14 needs to be done.

15 So, before we get to specifics, I want to ask
16 you if you share my sort of perception of what this
17 thing does? Okay? And - and is this the right order?

18 I mean has this group, in their best offer to
19 us, have they done those things we sent them back to
20 do? Leaving particular wording aside for the minute.

21 George? And speak into the microphone, please,
22 George.

1 MR. LAPOINTE: I am speaking into the
2 microphone, Mr. Chairman. I am about two inches away
3 from it.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry.

5 MR. LAPOINTE: I - when I look at the
6 introduction, here is my broad response. I am not
7 compelled.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not compelled? Okay.

9 MR. LAPOINTE: I am not compelled. And it is
10 way too long.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

12 MR. LAPOINTE: I don't mind your - you know,
13 your problem - here is - I think we need a one sentence
14 problem statement. We have to tell people what an MPA
15 is because we are so immersed in it that we think
16 everybody else knows, but everybody else doesn't. And
17 then tell people what a national system does. And do
18 that in about this much space.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: George, does it occur to us
20 that we will have an executive summary and probably a
21 list of recommendations that are one or two sentences
22 long? Does that change your opinion of the need for

1 brevity here?

2 MR. LAPOINTE: Maybe a little. But -

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe a little? Okay.

4 MR. LAPOINTE: But I get lost in this one.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Get lost in it?

6 MR. LAPOINTE: I mean it is too much.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Max, I shut you off

8 twice. I owe you two apologies at least. Be my

9 guest. And then Bonnie is on the list.

10 MR. PETERSON: Let me defer to George. He has

11 had more background on this whole business. Why don't

12 you go ahead and make your comments and I will follow

13 you, if that is okay?

14 MR. LAPOINTE: I am done.

15 MR. PETERSON: You are done? Okay. Mr.

16 Chairman, as I said, this is I think quite a good

17 document. It has been written by some people that

18 know the subject quite well.

19 I think there is a - one major concern that I

20 have that is in the third paragraph.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

22 MR. PETERSON: Well, let me first - let me

1 address the first paragraph.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

3 MR. PETERSON: I don't believe there is a big
4 - bigger national dialogue on the state of the oceans.
5 There may be in some circles, but I don't think there
6 has been a national dialogue -

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

8 MR. PETERSON: I think we ought to start off
9 with referring to these studies and pointing out that
10 they raise the concern for the ocean. But I don't
11 think we can start out by assuming that.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

13 MR. PETERSON: If you went on 60 Minutes you
14 would find a great national dialogue on the state of
15 the ocean.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

17 MR. PETERSON: I think that is an
18 overstatement. The third paragraph, I also don't
19 believe we can say there is strong scientific evidence
20 that MPAs can add value to those tools. I don't think
21 that is current present yet. I think if we are going
22 to say something there, I would say something that the

1 committee has concluded that a national system and
2 MPAs may well be a valuable tool or something like
3 that.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

5 MR. PETERSON: And then I would reverse the
6 order of those three things, three reasons for having
7 MPAs. The first one I think is providing a framework
8 for additional cooperation and coordination.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

10 MR. PETERSON: And then second is restoring
11 species and third is this reference sites.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

13 MR. PETERSON: Scientists love reference
14 sites, but the public thinks - you could have
15 reference sites without having national system MPAs.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good.

17 MR. PETERSON: Anyway, then one final thing.
18 The word governance is used about six times in this
19 document, which is not a user-friendly word. I think
20 we mean management.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

22 MR. PETERSON: There is all kinds of people

1 involved in management and not all of them are
2 governance. I think I would get rid of the word
3 governance wherever you can and insert management.

4 But let me conclude by saying I think there
5 is a lot of good work on the statement. And I think
6 it is in the right direction and I support the work on
7 it.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Right. Yeah, what we
9 will have to figure out is how we want to do that
10 work. Bonnie? And then I have Gil.

11 DR. McCAY: First of all, I commend the team.
12 I think they did an excellent job in laying out the
13 arguments for - for this enterprise. And I also
14 respect - I think I respect the points that Max made
15 and George.

16 And to the point George made, I, too, think
17 that this is not appropriate as the very beginning,
18 but I think it is - the second part of it, I would say
19 there is one short paragraph that starts off having
20 some kind of one sentence introduction and then a
21 definition. And then this becomes the argument - this
22 is the background argument for this.

1 And that is how I would suggest proceeding.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Gil?

3 MR. RADONSKI: I sort of looked at the
4 document and thought of it as the panacea document.
5 And I agree with Bonnie, it has got a solution, but it
6 doesn't - to an argument, but it doesn't state what
7 the argument is.

8 I think we throughout the whole synergistic
9 synergism document, not synergism, the synthesis
10 document, we have got to get in front of the
11 difference or non-difference between MPAs and MMAs.

12 If you go to the US Ocean Action Plan, MPAs
13 is mentioned once, MMAs are mentioned twenty-two
14 times. So, I mean we - somewhere we have got to get
15 this terminology up front. If there is a difference,
16 not a difference. But I think we have to deal with
17 that issue.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. Okay. What shall
19 we do? I am reluctant to turn over the next hour to
20 precise wording stuff by committee. Shall we tell
21 this group to go back and try yet again, we don't like
22 their best offer?

1 MR. RADONSKI: I think that is a little harsh,
2 we don't like it. I mean we -

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Okay.

4 MR. RADONSKI: You know, if we go through a
5 group criticism and that is fair.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Right. I am open. I -
7 Rod, what would be helpful?

8 DR. FUJITA: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be
9 most helpful if I think maybe George, Max and Bonnie
10 took a crack at the distinct - I am not great at that.

11 So, you know, take a shot at the one sentence problem
12 statement and a description and the differentiation of
13 MMAs.

14 I take all these comments as very
15 constructive. I think they are all very good. But I
16 don't feel up to addressing them. So, maybe we - if
17 you would appoint some people to.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Bob?

19 MR. BENDICK: I don't - I am not sure I agree
20 completely on this succinct thing because I find that
21 it is important in any document that you have enough
22 context and explanation at the beginning. So, someone

1 who does not understand all of it can orient
2 themselves to the issue, you know, in one page or so
3 or two pages. So that they understand what follows.

4 And I do think we are going to have an
5 executive summary. But I think we can go overboard
6 the other way because it doesn't speak to the public,
7 because the public - and maybe the public isn't going
8 to read any of this. But it doesn't speak to people
9 who are coming in later because they don't understand
10 the context.

11 And while this may be needs to be put in a
12 little bit simple language or public language, I
13 wouldn't make it a short paragraph because that
14 assumes everybody knows what all of this is about.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yep, that is the dilemma we
16 face. And I would ask everyone to keep in mind that
17 we will have an executive summary that will come
18 before this. And we will have - and we have to figure
19 out how we wish to do this.

20 We are going to have some recommendations up
21 front that may be part of the executive summary. They
22 may stand apart from it. So, there will be that

1 chance.

2 Okay. I have Dolly. I have Lelei and then I
3 have Larry. Dolly?

4 MS. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just two
5 comments, in terms of trying to strengthen it. In the
6 second paragraph, I think it was alluded to but not
7 specific that the state federal tribal management
8 programs may not be able to provide cross-cutting
9 ecosystem conservation.

10 And so - and I think, you know, in trying to
11 look at MPAs, it seems like that is what we are trying
12 to do, is provide this tool for, okay, we are not just
13 going to manage for salmon, we are not just going to
14 manage for this, we are going to try and do a big
15 picture conservation cultural preservation of an area.

16 And that these individual governing bodies
17 may not have that capability. If you look at the
18 State of Alaska, in terms of fisheries management, in
19 the state constitution it requires that the Board of
20 Fish manage for maximum benefit.

21 Under that kind of language, it makes it very
22 difficult to manage for conservation. And so those

1 kinds of tools to me are lacking. And that is the
2 intent of something like MPA. Thank you.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Lelei?

4 MR. PEAU: Chairman, I just want to ask for
5 clarification, maybe perhaps this will help guide the
6 discussion. And first who is the audience? I thought
7 our job is to report and make a recommendation to -

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: The secretary.

9 MR. PEAU: Secretaries of Commerce -

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

11 MR. PEAU: So, I assume they would have some
12 knowledge about -

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I don't know about that.

14 MR. PEAU: Okay. At the same time -

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: You are far more generous than
16 I, Lelei, but - yeah, they have - they have a context.
17 Of course they do.

18 MR. PEAU: It is a reality check. No. But at
19 the same time, I am saying that I think this document,
20 we talked about political will, I think we need to go
21 beyond that. But I think that a point of
22 clarification because that would help the organization

1 of this introduction.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. No, that is a very good
3 point. Larry?

4 MR. MALONEY: I was basically going to make
5 the same point. That this report is going to the
6 Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Commerce.
7 It is - one, it is a public document, don't think the
8 public is necessarily who the primary audience.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Well, that is right. We
10 need to keep that in mind.

11 MR. MALONEY: I can assure you the Secretary
12 Gutierrez has a good grasp of these issues.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Yeah. Good. Okay.
14 Rod? And then John?

15 DR. FUJITA: Yeah. This is all very relevant.
16 What I was going to say - I just wanted to take a
17 second to explain the rationale for this structure.
18 The first paragraph problem statement is about public
19 concern because we assume that the audience were the
20 Secretaries and the statement of public concern would
21 resonate with them.

22 It could very well start with a statement of

1 - or a problem statement that is more about the state
2 of the fish or the state of coral reefs or the state
3 of the ocean in general. Right?

4 So, we have to make a choice. What is more
5 compelling to our audience? Is it the fact that
6 people are worried about the ocean or is it that the
7 ocean is in some state of decline.

8 The other assumption that we made in drafting
9 this is that we felt we - we had to provide some
10 language in here explaining the context and a little
11 bit of detail. Because although Secretary Norton may
12 be well apprised of these issues, we assume that the
13 Secretary of Commerce, who just came on board eight
14 days ago, would not be.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. Thanks, Rod. I
16 have Terry then I have John Halsey. Terry?

17 MR. O'HALLORAN: Thank you. When I read this,
18 it is hard for me to think about condensing and
19 abbreviating or making - trying to make this part more
20 succinct without having read the executive summary.

21 And I think I would caution us to - because
22 the way I read a document is I read the executive

1 summary first. And then if I want more meat to it, I
2 like what I am reading, I go to the document. And
3 there I want - I want more meat on the bone.

4 And so I would think that that is the
5 executive summary is where we would want to make it a
6 little bit more succinct. And maybe we would wait
7 before we try and do that until we see what that
8 executive summary is going to look like.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: okay. John?

10 DR. HALSEY: Our subject is marine protected
11 areas. By definition that also includes the Great
12 Lakes. And I blanch each time I see the word ocean
13 because I think for most people that means strictly
14 salt water. All of the problems we have been
15 discussing in the ocean are also taking place in the
16 Great Lakes. So, I think we need to get back to
17 marine.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Marine? Yeah.

19 DR. HALSEY: Because the person from Michigan
20 or Wisconsin or Minnesota that reads this is happy to
21 see that this connects with them at all. So, we have
22 to do that. That over-arching view.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob?

2 MR. BENDICK: Yeah, I - I don't mean to be
3 argumentative, but I do think that - I mean we are a
4 public body, open to the public. We have very broad
5 representation.

6 And I think we have gotten all in these sorts
7 of things too much into the habit of using a language,
8 you know, experts to secretaries or whatever that
9 isn't accessible to the public. And it undermines
10 sort of the ability of people, a broad group of people
11 to participate and understand what we are doing and
12 why we are doing it.

13 And I don't think it is good for our
14 democracy to do that. To convey the idea that they
15 are experts talking in a special language to other
16 experts. And this - we are close to having this
17 language be accessible to almost everybody.

18 And I think we should strive in that to do
19 that. Because ultimately all these decisions are not
20 technical, they are political. They depend on the
21 will of people to want to do things. And the
22 interpretation of the Secretaries and the Congress of

1 the will of the people. And we should find the common
2 medium here.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Nice. Thank you, Bob.
4 What I would like to propose is that, with this group
5 and the people who have raised their - a new
6 delegation go back to work on this at a future time
7 here this morning.

8 But that it be a larger and a bit more
9 inclusive group so that there might be some of you who
10 like it exactly as it is. And I would urge you to go
11 to that group and fight to keep it as it is. And
12 there might be others who want to change it and let
13 them do it. And see if we can't argue that out at
14 that small group level. Okay?

15 So, it shouldn't be just the two or three
16 people who are going to work it over. But, if you
17 like the way it is, go to that group and make your
18 case as Bob has just done. So, would that be all
19 right?

20 Who might want to go do that? Have you got a
21 list of people that are going to? Yeah, George and
22 Terry and Max and Steve and Bob and Mark. Okay.

1 Good.

2 I think it is close, Rod. I think it is
3 close. And you should be commended for the work you
4 folks did because this is not easy to do. So, thank
5 you very much.

6 All right. The regional group? Well, we are
7 just going to go down the list. Where do we stand?
8 Who is the group that was going to work on some
9 regional stuff? We have an asterisk by their name
10 which meant they were going to do a bit more crafting.
11 George?

12 MR. LAPOINTE: We - is my mic close enough?

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. LAPOINTE: We -

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: The mic is close enough, you
16 are just not close enough to the mic.

17 MR. LAPOINTE: I understand that. We - we did
18 some fine tuning of the language. And what we need
19 now and we didn't do it because we knew people were
20 re-crafting other sections is where that new language
21 goes. So that is a remaining question, Mr. Chairman.
22 And until we wrestle with the rest of the document, I

1 think we should pull that until later.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you. All
3 right. Implementation. Mary? Did we - we don't have
4 an asterisk by you. I think maybe - oh, that is
5 right, yeah, you guys had some more work to do.

6 MS. GLACKIN: Yes. We met yesterday. We kind
7 of got sub-critical. We went down to just Eric,
8 myself and Mike was there for part of the time. We do
9 actually have some language to show you if we could
10 bring it up, if you want to do that.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

12 MS. GLACKIN: I don't know if you want to do
13 that. The first thing I would call to your attention
14 would be in the current document on page - line 133.

15 So, Lauren it is - it is at the bottom of
16 page three. And we took the suggestion that Mark had
17 offered yesterday as one way to help deal with,

18 In fact, if I could say for a minute. One of
19 things I think we have been struggling with in
20 implementation is how, in fact, do we get a network as
21 opposed to a collection. And I thought the comments
22 that we started with this morning, the public comments

1 this morning were kind of right on target. And we
2 have heard some of that here with the discussion of
3 the first section.

4 And I think one of the concerns we have had
5 is that that is not coming through how you actually
6 end up with the network, as opposed to a bunch of
7 volunteers.

8 So, we took this suggestion here and offer
9 that to the larger group, to put the word ecological
10 in. And I would hasten to say it is already in the
11 glossary in the back. So, it is not a new term for
12 us. But it is specifically trying to get at this
13 linkage aspect.

14 The next changes that we have are on page
15 eight under procedural issues. And we have - while we
16 have some words to offer here and I am hoping my
17 eyesight is going to be good enough to read them, we
18 don't - we are not really proud of them as a final
19 polished product at the end.

20 But that first - the first change, which
21 would be offering a new 2.0, talks about - tries to
22 get to the idea of criteria. It turns out that later

1 in the document we refer to criteria that have to be
2 met, but we actually don't have those criteria any
3 place.

4 So, this is assigning to the federal level
5 here the responsibility to establish minimum criteria
6 for individual MPAs. And that those criteria ought to
7 consider management, monitoring, performance
8 standards, enforcement and financing.

9 So, we were trying to fill a gap we perceived
10 as here. And it could be that it is some place else.

11 And this is kind of the difficulty of how this
12 document is laid out. When it talks about an MOU
13 later, I think it is kind of implicit in the MOU. But
14 the specific criteria isn't there.

15 On what is number - the new number four up
16 there, we took away the words that were work with
17 Congress to provide funding for the system. And just
18 make them a little more - kind of a higher level here
19 to say establish sustainable financing for the system.

20 And then number five is also probably not
21 completely done. Remember five dealt with - we
22 mentioned yesterday that another part of having a

1 system should be the synergisms in the administration
2 of the system.

3 So, this assigns the responsibility to the
4 federal level to develop mechanisms to enhance
5 efficient and effective coordination and cooperation
6 among the MPAs, which hadn't been in there before.

7 And finally in this section, we took the
8 current wording in section four, as you can read in
9 your hard copy refers to just developing national
10 priorities to be considered for regional entities.
11 And I think that - we thought that that was the very
12 top of the mountaintop about how to get these linkages
13 that we are looking for. That that would have to be.

14 So, we tried to make that a little more - to
15 remind the reader a little more in terms of those
16 national priorities should include filling ecological,
17 and we may need to defer to some different people for
18 words here, and cultural gaps in the national system.

19 So, I think we feel good about the spirit of
20 what we are doing. We are not completely enamored
21 with all of our words because we - there wasn't a lot
22 of us working on it. And we were kind of hampered in

1 how we were doing it.

2 We have, I think, two more changes, Lauren.

3 If you could go through and -

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: What page number?

5 MS. GLACKIN: Just keep going right down. It
6 is all right in this section. You can see right
7 there. We just made, under number three, it said
8 coordinate research. And this is what the regional
9 entities need to do. And the current text said
10 coordinate research and monitoring at various levels.

11 And we changed that to read enhance management
12 coordination among the MPAs. Trying to get at, again
13 - I am sorry - I am sorry, I am confusing things here.

14

15 The current language said facilitate
16 continued management coordinations among MPAs across
17 regional and national boundaries. Here we did
18 something Dan likes, as we made it shorter.

19 We said just enhance management coordination
20 among MPAs and got rid of all the boundaries and
21 everything.

22 And then, Lauren, I think there is one more

1 just right there. You can stop I think right there.

2 This is where I had mentioned before that the
3 text refers to - it says we envision a national system
4 being created from existing and new marine sites,
5 meeting the criteria spelled out above. And this
6 reference of Roman number I^o) is kind of spurious. It
7 doesn't go back to anything. So, we now have it
8 referred back to where we said the criteria needs to
9 be established.

10 So, I don't think we feel particularly good
11 that implementation is now clear in this document. We
12 feel more that we have worked on a few of the problems
13 that we saw.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I ask a question, Mary,
15 about back up above there about financing? And this
16 is Bob Bendick and I over breakfast. Would it - we
17 are talking about financing. And then there is this
18 talk about an ocean trust fund.

19 Would this be the point where one might say
20 for instance there is discussion of an ocean trust
21 fund? I mean do we want to connect it to some
22 existing documents in that way? Kind of an aside

1 statement? Or do we want to talk about that at all?

2 MS. GLACKIN: Well, wearing my Department of
3 Commerce hat, I don't think it is going to make any
4 difference whether you do that or not.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

6 MS. GLACKIN: I think that the sentiment from
7 our subgroup, which I kind of accept, was there needs
8 to be new money on the table for this.

9 I thought you were going to challenge me on
10 the word financing. I am not completely enamored with
11 that word.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: How about funding?

13 MS. GLACKIN: From a federal bureaucratic
14 point of view. Funding is probably better,
15 sustainable funding. That is more of a word we see
16 and use more.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. Okay. Mark?

18 DR. HIXON: Mary, the issue of criteria, this
19 is - these are criteria for defining MPAs from
20 existing MMAs?

21 MS. GLACKIN: That is right. I think what we
22 were trying to get at is what distinguishes a site.

1 You know, what are the characteristics. And, for
2 example, I think my thought anyway had been is that
3 you wouldn't be in this national network unless, for
4 example, there was a minimum amount of monitoring
5 going on. So that you would be able to say at some
6 point in time whether you are, in fact, meeting the
7 objectives. You know, that we just don't -

8 DR. HIXON: So, this is adding then to the
9 criteria that are already in here under the definition
10 of MPA and each of the key words in the EO definition
11 of MPA being explicitly defined. This is going beyond
12 that, then.

13 MS. GLACKIN: Okay. Can you show me a little
14 more explicitly what you mean?

15 DR. HIXON: Sure. So, the intent - so, on the
16 last draft on page four, the paragraph starting on
17 line 145 then going into the definition, the EO
18 definition starting on line 151.

19 The idea here in our original committee work
20 was to define the key words in the OE definition of
21 MPA. And in so doing, provide the filter that would
22 enable the federal government to take the inventory of

1 MMAs and then say, okay, here are the existing MPAs
2 that we already have in the United States.

3 MS. GLACKIN: Let me Eric address this. I see
4 the problem.

5 DR. HIXON: Sure.

6 MR. GILMAN: We weren't trying to change the
7 definition of a Marine protected area, we were trying
8 to avoid having paper parts added to this system.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Eric, can you get a bit closer?
10 I am sorry, there is -

11 MR. GILMAN: The intent was to try to avoid
12 having paper parts added to the system. We were fine
13 with the way MPAs are already defined.

14 And we weren't excluding the criteria to
15 existing MMAs that could be existing or for new sites.

16 So, the intent was to ensure that the purposes that
17 the protected area or new protected area are supposed
18 to fulfill are actually going to be fulfilled. That
19 they had the governance structure in place. That they
20 had financing to conduct enforcement in honoring.
21 That kind of thing.

22 DR. HIXON: So, this is for then adding new

1 MPAs, entities that don't currently exist, as opposed
2 to filtering the existing MMAs?

3 MR. GILMAN: It is for adding new sites.

4 DR. HIXON: For adding new sites? Okay. So
5 that in the existing document, that is tentatively
6 addressed in section 2(d), which starts on line 163.
7 So that is sort of what was existed in the document,
8 in terms of adding new sites. So, it sounds like it
9 is a matter of flushing that out.

10 MS. GLACKIN: I think that is right. And I do
11 continue to be kind of a little bit troubled by the
12 organization. I am not sure that I could suggest a
13 better one. But in terms of where we do it.

14 DR. HIXON: Okay. Thanks for the
15 clarification.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Max?

17 MR. PETERSON: First, I agree that there is
18 criteria in about three places. I am not quite sure
19 how we get it together. But it is a little confusing
20 how we mention criteria and in at least two other
21 places that there is criteria. So, we need to look at
22 that organizational question.

1 But a bigger question is that this whole
2 chore is proposed to be done by pertinent federal
3 agencies. They don't mention a consultation with the
4 states or tribes or anybody else. And I think in the
5 preamble that we need to say other pertinent federal
6 agencies in consultation with states, tribes,
7 territories and so on.

8 Because it looks like they are just go in the
9 back room and do this. And that would be a great
10 mistake, I think.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good.

12 MR. PETERSON: I am sure you are not going to
13 do that, Mary, but we need to have some -

14 MS. GLACKIN: No, I agree. And, in fact, we
15 verbally said that yesterday and just didn't get back
16 to correct it.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Wonderful. Thank you. Where
18 do we stand? How do you - do we want to? I think
19 people are happy with the - at the micro level of sort
20 of the language, Mary.

21 But Max's point and others raise some issues
22 about criteria being scattered and so on, which have

1 important implications for the structure of the
2 report. And I don't know quite how we address that
3 right now.

4 But should we move on and then come back to it?

5 MS. GLACKIN: We can do that. I think the
6 other thing would be is if we had some help. If a few
7 more volunteers with us, you know -

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

9 MS. GLACKIN: I think this is not an
10 insurmountable problem. We just kind of ran out of
11 time.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we round up a few willing
13 souls? Mark? Good. Somebody else? Thank you.
14 Carol? Wonderful. Okay. So, now we have another
15 group going to work on this.

16 MS. GLACKIN: Thank you.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Okay. As I look at the
18 chart behind me, I think there is only one more
19 asterisk, which is on customary knowledge. Bonnie?

20 DR. McCAY: Yes. I didn't realize we were
21 coming up so quickly.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry.

1 DR. McCAY: I am not sure. It probably isn't
2 necessary for us to put this up. We did make some
3 changes. They are - to try to be clear and more in
4 line with the appropriate usage of terms. And so I -
5 we have basically gotten rid of the phrase customary
6 knowledge, reinserted traditional ecological knowledge
7 where appropriate and made some clarifications in the
8 glossary and clarifications in the text.

9 And if anyone wants to see that right now,
10 they are welcome to it. But I am not sure we need to
11 go through that.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

13 DR. McCAY: I must also say that we also - we
14 had raised the question about the non-existence of the
15 term subsistence and ceremonial in the document. And
16 happily, those were put into the document
17 appropriately by Rod's committee.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So, here we sit. We
19 have two groups that would have a task to do. We have
20 an opportunity to go around and write on the post tabs
21 there, whatever they are called.

22 Are there people who would like to take a -

1 sort of a macro look at the document and help us with
2 organization? Are there? This came out in Mary's
3 comments and so on. Is there a need to take a look at
4 the way the bricks are put together here?

5 MR. PETERSON: Yes.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, okay. Is there a group
7 that would be willing to tackle that? And by this, I
8 mean you are looking at the order in which the bricks
9 appear, so to speak, with a minimum attention to
10 precise wording, but structural organizational piece.

11 Who would like to tackle that one? David?
12 No? Oh, Lauren? Wonderful. Okay. Others? Yeah,
13 Lauren, it would be wonderful if you would. Max?
14 Others? George?

15 MR. LAPOINTE: I think everybody should be
16 interested in that, Mr. Chairman. If we volunteered
17 for other efforts, how we can do -

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Both?

19 MR. LAPOINTE: Once I think is -

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

21 MR. LAPOINTE: An issue.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that is right. So, we

1 can work on that. I mean if we find two or three
2 other people and then there is some conflicts, yes, we
3 will accommodate that. But I don't see many
4 volunteers yet. So, maybe a larger number of people
5 ought to be involved. What is your sense? George?

6 MR. LAPOINTE: I will volunteer for the - how
7 the bricks fit together.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then John? Yeah, John.
9 All right. Well, you know, other can go. I think
10 what we will do - what I wonder if we want to do now
11 is stop this. We have three groups who are going to
12 go do more work.

13 What are those three groups? Where is my
14 brain? The implementation is going to do more work.
15 The why group, the introduction group is going to do
16 more work. And then sort of the organizational, the
17 bricks piece of it. Those are three groups.

18 We do have the Mount Vernon room on the first
19 floor. We can split here. And also at your - at your
20 leisure, if you would enter your minor concerns here
21 on these charts.

22 What do you want? Do you want an hour to go

1 away and do this? I think the last group has the more
2 vague charge.

3 And maybe - I mean you are free to proceed as
4 you wish, but one thing might be for you to come back
5 to us with one or two alternative structures, which
6 would not get into the specifics of the paragraph, but
7 would be to say, okay, now we have section one, A, B,
8 C, D. We have section two, A, B, C. We have section
9 three, A and B. And we now, looking at this, we think
10 it would be better if that were put up there.

11 So - and if you look at it and come back and
12 say, you know, we can't improve upon it, we are happy
13 with that.

14 But if it also - I think the point here is
15 lets look at that larger sections of the document, see
16 if the flow is right. See if we mention stuff later
17 on that has not been properly introduced before.

18 I think it would be wonderful to have a group
19 of you sort of look at that. Not the wording, per se,
20 but the structure.

21 Why don't we report back here at ten o'clock?

22 And then we will see what we need to do from there.

1 Yeah, I did. And don't forget the wall
2 stuff. Use your ink pen or magic markers. Heidi has
3 put the double layer there. Try to confine your
4 writing to the paper, not on the wall.

5 And put your name so we can get back to you.
6 The idea is go there and if you have specific
7 comments, you know, either write it out or say, look,
8 you need to see me about line such and such, so we
9 know how to trace it back.

10 DR. HIXON: Dan, would you please identify
11 there the groups are meeting, just in case there is
12 questions going between the groups?

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Who is the largest
14 group? The one group gets the Mount Vernon room
15 unless all three of you just want to stay here. I
16 don't care. Somebody want to claim the Mount Vernon
17 room?

18 MS. WENZEL: Why don't we send the why group
19 back there?

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Send the why group back to the
21 Mount Vernon room. Okay. And then the other two
22 groups can meet wherever they want here.

1 MS. WENZEL: The organization group can meet
2 in here.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Yeah, the organization
4 group can meet right here.

5 (A brief recess was taken.)

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: We are ready to go to work
7 here. Okay, I think we need to get organized again.
8 Okay. On the flip chart on the left I put down a
9 proposed set of tasks that we face.

10 On organization we will hear from the
11 organization group. They have distributed, near as I
12 can tell, an outline. It is their best offer.

13 We are going to talk about implementation.
14 And we will hear from the implementation group.

15 We will take a quick look at the executive
16 summary/recommendations. Kind of an outline for it.
17 Placeholders.

18 Then we will turn our attention to the
19 hieroglyphics over here on the wall. Look at them
20 closely. It is not clear how much time we will be
21 able to spend on them. It is also a mystery whether
22 we will be able to read all of it.

1 But the point is, these are marvelous
2 comments. We probably want to try to find out the
3 author of each of them so we will be able to get back
4 to you in case we don't understand your point. I
5 don't know that everybody signed their name to what
6 they said.

7 But we will work our way through that. And
8 then our lunch speaker comes at 12:30. After lunch,
9 we will ask ourselves why we are here and Rod will
10 tell us.

11 And then we will have a chance to revisit the
12 executive summary and recommendations.

13 And we are not quite sure what time this will
14 be when we get there. But we have - we have a good
15 bit of the afternoon yet. So, that is the plan.
16 Okay?

17 All right. So, the first is the organization
18 structure, the revised outline for the document. All
19 right? Are you going to put that on the screen,
20 Lauren, or do we want to talk about it?

21 MS. WENZEL: Talk. Because people have it in
22 front of them.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, you should have a
2 sheet of paper called revised outline for document.
3 Dave needs one? Oh, yes.

4 MR. BENTON: Thanks. I had to get my
5 microphone so you didn't get me - put me in the same
6 box.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, Dave, we can hear you
8 without a microphone.

9 MR. BENTON: Could you, before we get into
10 this, sort of - the question sort of swirling around
11 my mind is, given where we are at, what you see as
12 being the next step after we round up all these
13 pieces? Because they are not going to be together at
14 the end of the day today. Right?

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

16 MR. BENTON: Could you just give us sort of a
17 sketch about the next steps and maybe the schedule you
18 might have in mind?

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Wonderful. Right. Well, you
20 are right. I guess when we leave here, if we are
21 lucky, we will have a new organizational structure.
22 We will have nice ideas for wording changes. We will

1 have new language about implementation. We will have
2 - let me say a tentative list of kind of an executive
3 summary and recommendations.

4 So, let's pretend that we do succeed in
5 having that. There will be quite a bit of writing and
6 rewriting that needs to be done. I don't know how
7 much new writing there will need to be. I hope not
8 very much. But there will need to be lots of
9 rewriting.

10 We will have to talk about how we deal with
11 that. My guess would be that there will be a small
12 group of us that will be responsible for, shall we
13 say, rewriting. And my proposal would be that the
14 executive committee be tasked with doing that.

15 And then we will have to set some deadlines
16 for distributing it back to everyone. We will have to
17 set some deadlines for getting it back.

18 And then we will have to set a deadline for
19 the full distribution of the revised draft report for
20 final adoption in May.

21 That is my - David?

22 MR. BENTON: Yeah, I thought that was probably

1 the general outline, which sounds fine. I - the main
2 thing that I want - the reason I asked the question is
3 to see whether or not or encourage you, I guess, in
4 your building of that time-line to get a turnaround on
5 whatever comes out of here fairly quickly so we have a
6 fair amount of time to get comments back.

7 Because I think when you get them, you may
8 wind up - you may or may not wind up with that writing
9 group having yet another task in front of them.

10 And so I just wondered how you thought that
11 through. And I just wanted to encourage that that -
12 the turnaround, right after this meeting, be fairly
13 quick so we have plenty of time before we get to May
14 if you want to finalize this. And I --

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. And - now, that is
16 right. And the problem we get into here now is that
17 all of you will receive something that has been I
18 guess rewritten. I mean, you know, we will take this
19 stuff. You will get something that has been
20 rewritten.

21 And it is at that point that we enter
22 dangerous territory. Because I can well imagine one

1 or more people saying, well, I want you to change this
2 or that.

3 So, we duly change this or that and it goes
4 back out. And then we encounter people who say, wait
5 a minute, I liked it the way it was before. Why in
6 the world did you change this or that they way you
7 changed it?

8 And we spiral downward very quickly from
9 that. So, I don't quite know how to deal with this.
10 We are at a point when we have to call a halt to all
11 of this stuff. And it is not that I don't want more
12 work writing, it is that the danger is, of course, we
13 start to loose people the more we craft and recraft.

14 So, I am open to how you want to do this.
15 But my guess is there needs to be one round of
16 changes. And one round meaning it goes out to the
17 full group, they make some recommendations. The
18 executive committee tries to recraft it and it comes
19 back out. And I guess unless you overrule me, I would
20 like to sort of call a halt at that point. And we
21 come in May. You will have it, maybe mid-April.
22 Plenty of time to read it.

1 And it is at that point, I guess, because
2 then in May we have to decide whether we want to adopt
3 this thing or not. It is at that point, I guess, that
4 we have to address the difficult point of, okay, are
5 there things in here to which there is such objection
6 that we need to take them out.

7 And I think in May we need to be at the point
8 of pulling stuff out or leaving it in, not recrafting
9 it yet again. I don't know how else to avoid a
10 continual crafting. If somebody has better ideas, I
11 am open. I guess everybody probably sees the
12 potential dilemma we face. Right? In terms of
13 redoing, redoing, redoing. And then creating
14 apprehension about what has been redone to satisfy A,
15 but now not satisfying B.

16 Max?

17 MR. PETERSON: I am in general agreement with
18 what you are talking about. But I think you - you
19 ought to invite anybody on the committee that wants to
20 give you any comments and let the executive committee
21 look at those and decide whether there is something
22 that is either not clear or something that you want

1 to, you can create another draft.

2 Because we are not very good as a committee
3 on the whole in writing things. So, I would rather,
4 when you send out what the executive committee writes
5 to ask us if we have got any comment. And if anybody
6 comments, they ought to send to the other members of
7 the committee so we all see this.

8 And it might well be that somebody else might
9 say I looked at Mark's comments and I agree with them.

10 Just so you get a - you might get a more of a
11 consensus than you think on some things.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Okay.

13 MR. PETERSON: And that might help us.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is good.

15 MR. PETERSON: That is just a little small
16 change.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. No, I think that is
18 nice. And, in fact, when we whenever we get to the
19 wall charts there, I think we were going to do some of
20 the same thing. I mean there are some very specific
21 things up there. And it could well be that there are
22 people in the room who, when they look at that, they

1 say, no, no, no, I don't want that change to be made.

2 So, in a sense, we are already, as I
3 understand it, we are sort of thinking about even
4 looking at that stuff with that in mind, Max. I mean
5 at this point, people in the room will have a chance
6 to do that.

7 But, you are right. I mean ultimately
8 somebody is going to have to say no, this is what we
9 are going forward with. And if we - yeah. Mark, your
10 hand was up?

11 DR. HIXON: Thank you. I agree overall with
12 what you are saying. I do have a concern, though.
13 Given and assuming that everyone is operating in good
14 faith, by the time May comes around, I would envision
15 a vote on the entire document, rather than saying,
16 okay, we are going to vote now to include or not
17 include section one, to include or not include section
18 two. Because yanking out any one section at that
19 point would surely get the entire document. By that
20 time, I think it is just a vote on the whole thing.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Well, I think that is
22 right, Mark. I didn't mean to imply that we can just

1 pull out sections or something. I think that is what
2 we would like to move towards. That we are voting on
3 the entire thing.

4 And at that point, perhaps, I have been
5 reluctant to bring it up, but at that point, if there
6 are strong feelings, then maybe people would like to
7 draft a dissenting section or a minority report or
8 something. I hope we don't get to that.

9 But, yeah, in May it seems to me it is all or
10 nothing. It is the whole package or we -

11 Michael?

12 DR. CRUICKSHANK: I was just thinking, Mr.
13 Chairman, that when we spawn through the draft that
14 comes out, that everybody responds to everybody else.

15 So, that everybody sees it once. If there is an
16 issue that they want to raise against it. Just for
17 ease of cooperation.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Mack, could you get the mic
19 closer to your mouth and repeat that? I am sorry. I
20 think it is important, but I don't -

21 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Is it on?

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is better.

1 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Repeat?

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: We tried yesterday to get them
3 to turn up the volume in this room and somehow they
4 can't do it. So, I am sorry I keep hanging on it.
5 People must be able to hear. So -

6 DR. CRUICKSHANK: It is barely enough for the
7 Karoke system to -

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever. Could you repeat
9 what you said briefly?

10 DR. CRUICKSHANK: What I was saying is that
11 when we get the first draft -

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: When we get the first draft?
13 What is that? Is that after we go away from here and
14 the executive committee has something? Is that what
15 you mean?

16 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Somebody will rewrite it.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now what?

18 DR. CRUICKSHANK: We presume they will get the
19 draft, full draft. And then we will be asked for
20 comments.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

22 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Anybody who comments then

1 would respond to the committee as a whole. So, we
2 would all get it at the same time. And it even has -

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: So, we are sort of back where
4 we were in November and December? Is that the thing?
5 Back to spreadsheets and Excel cells?

6 DR. CRUICKSHANK: No. The thing is, as they
7 come through, if anybody does have an objection to
8 what is being changed, that they can immediately
9 respond to it, rather than waiting for those. I found
10 the spreadsheets a little difficult to work with,
11 actually.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

13 DR. CRUICKSHANK: And straight old written
14 language is easy to respond to, I think.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you clear on this, Lauren?

16 MS. WENZEL: Yeah.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Can it be done?

18 MS. WENZEL: Yes.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Quickly? Thank you. I have
20 Brian, David. Brian?

21 DR. MELZIAN: Just as a suggestion, during the
22 development of integrated ocean observing plans, first

1 annual plan and that is a point I would like to make,
2 is that this report needs to be completed sooner
3 rather than later.

4 But it is an iterative process. So, we cut
5 ourselves a break. I absolutely guaranty it is going
6 to evolve over time.

7 What they did with the IOOS development plan
8 is that the federal agencies submitted formal
9 comments. Then ocean dot US incorporated those in a
10 track change document, where the comment would say EPA
11 and then response. And it was included in the
12 document.

13 And then we met formally, Rick Spinrad and
14 others at the meeting. And we all could see that our
15 comment was considered and incorporated or not
16 incorporated. And we went from there.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

18 DR. MELZIAN: That is just a suggestion.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Okay. Good. David?

20 MR. BENTON: Just a - I - listening to your
21 dialogue with Mark, I still - I am hoping that that is
22 not the all or nothing caveat isn't to where thorough,

1 during the course of our discussions, that when we
2 show up in May, we can have a discussion about, hey, a
3 little bit of a change here or a little bit of a
4 change there would greatly improve this document.

5 We could still have that kind of discussion
6 and have the flexibility to make those kinds of
7 changes. Otherwise, we don't need to meet, we can
8 just vote up or done on a phone poll and save
9 ourselves a lot of travel time.

10 But it seems to me that having that
11 opportunity to make last minute adjustments might not
12 be a bad idea.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right. I would not
14 want to - as wonderful as this has been the last
15 couple of days, I don't want to repeat it in May. It
16 has been a lot fun.

17 So, I think there is that need, David. And I
18 will grant you. Tundi and then Mike Nussman.

19 DR. AGARDY: I just wondered, Dan, if you can
20 clarify the process for the voting. Is it assume that
21 we need unanimous consensus to have this report go
22 forward? And do you really envision somebody who has

1 objections to the findings of the report coming up
2 with a counter report? I think that would be -

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I hope not. I - I don't
4 know that we have any - we are not a body that has
5 some legal rule about quorums and consensus and
6 everything else.

7 Consensus to me is not unanimity, although
8 those two words are confused in the English language.
9 Consensus is we have, you know, with one or two
10 exceptions, we find this to be a really nice document.

11 And the people who choose not to find it nice are
12 free to figure out how to express, if they feel like
13 they want to articulate their objections. With luck,
14 we won't run into that.

15 Is that okay? Tundi?

16 DR. AGARDY: No. But I wondered if there was
17 a formal mechanism for people to, for instance, not
18 have their names on the report if they object to it?

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a formal - for people
20 not have their name on the report?

21 DR. AGARDY: Yeah. I mean if somebody objects
22 to the report, rather than trying to amend the report

1 at that point in time? I mean other committees,
2 National Research Council Committees, for instance,
3 you just don't put your name on it if you disagree
4 with the findings.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't know that - I
6 don't know this. Okay? I have not done this before.

7 But I was not under the impression that we
8 are here as co-authors. We are a body that has
9 submitted a report.

10 So, the fact that - you know, how does
11 somebody take their name off the report? I don't know
12 how that is done. I don't know why we would want to
13 do that. I could easily imagine there being two or
14 three people who might vote not to approve the entire
15 thing.

16 It is up to them whether they want to be
17 identified and whether they wish to articulate what it
18 was exactly they didn't like. But, you know, I am
19 open to those of you that have had more experience
20 with this than I have.

21 Wait a minute. Okay, I have got Mike Nussman
22 and then I - where is my list. Mike, I know is on it.

1 Bob - but I think that is a previous list.

2 Go ahead, Mike and then Max.

3 MR. NUSSMAN: I think I will defer to Max. I
4 want to hear what he has to say? Actually, I was just
5 moving my hands.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good movement, Mike. Okay.
7 Max?

8 MR. PETERSON: Let me suggest that in May we -
9 we are - when we get the document from you all as a
10 revised draft that we respond only with major
11 concerns. That we don't try to edit or something. So
12 that we can just deal with major concerns.

13 The question is, what does an advisory
14 committee do. There is no rule that an advisory
15 committee has to be unanimous or anything like that.

16 But usually there is a provision that if
17 somebody feels strongly enough about the report, they
18 can say in the report that I am - general agreement
19 with this report, but I do not agree with this
20 recommendation or that recommendation.

21 And that is a part of the report. They don't
22 take their name off the report. But it could be that

1 the report - somebody would say I just cannot buy this
2 particular recommendation in this report. And, in
3 order to be honest, you have got to provide that
4 opportunity.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

6 MR. PETERSON: I would hope we don't do that.

7 But that - as far as I know, all advisory committees
8 provide that opportunity for somebody to be able to
9 say I just simply don't agree with that particular
10 recommendation.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good.

12 MR. PETERSON: Okay.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is what I was trying to
14 do. They don't take their name off the report, they
15 just say, you know, I liked a lot of it, but here is
16 something I couldn't agree with and here is why.

17 MR. PETERSON: They can say I agree with all
18 the report but this recommendation or the case hasn't
19 been made for this. Okay?

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Okay. I have George and
21 Dolly.

22 MR. LAPOINTE: I would - I am glad we are

1 talking about progress. But I hope people, if they
2 have major concerns for which they might take their
3 name off the report, they worked their butts off to
4 get those comments known now, Mr. Chairman.]

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right.

6 MR. LAPOINTE: We are talking about avenues
7 for George to get queasy and say, geeze, I don't want
8 to go to Portland and vote for this report. I would
9 rather discuss ways for George to be able to say, yes,
10 my name is on this report and with the whole shooting
11 match.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right. I mean that has
13 been - I mean we have heard good faith. We have heard
14 head on. And, indeed, that has been our operating
15 style. I think we have provided ample fora or
16 opportunities for people to get that done now. So,
17 yeah, I would be disappointed if there are snakes in
18 the grass, George. But, Dolly?

19 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A couple of
20 points. One, I agree with Max that if there are major
21 changes or major concerns that we as committee members
22 should make them known to the rest before the May

1 meeting. So, I am coming to the May meeting with a
2 concern about this. So we have an idea of what may be
3 left, other than minor nit picking, which I am sure
4 will occur.

5 Secondly, in terms of the voting, at the
6 initial meeting we did agree to Robert's Rules of
7 Order. And under that, when you vote, it is 51
8 percent unless otherwise determined. So, if we want
9 something that resembles a consensus or a two-third
10 majority, we need to state that now or before we go to
11 the next meeting.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Spoken like our
13 parliamentarian, Dolly. Thank you. We want to be
14 clear about the rules before we go in, not when we run
15 into a problem.

16 Let's - yeah. Oh, Bob - Bob Bendick.

17 MR. BENDICK: Well, this, I think there is
18 really - it is really important, given the composition
19 of the committee, if we can reach a consensus.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: What is consensus?

21 MR. BENDICK: It will - everybody -

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Unanimity?

1 MR. BENDICK: Buy off on each recommendation.
2 We will have much more - the report will have much
3 more authority. And I think if there are major
4 issues, I am not saying it has to be that way, but it
5 would be better if there are major issues that people
6 raised, having seen this draft. We ought to have a
7 list of those and those ought to be the first series
8 of things we do in May.

9 We should start the meeting by trying to
10 resolve those difficult issues, if there are difficult
11 issues. It never works to put those things off until
12 the end. And you need - sometimes you need a lot of
13 time to - I have worked on committees until four in
14 the morning.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, my goodness.

16 MR. BENDICK: On trying to do just this. And
17 it is worthwhile doing it. But you have got to - it
18 is the highest order of business.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Indeed. That was sort of my
20 assumption in terms of how we started yesterday.
21 Started on the big issues, rather than the words.
22 But, yeah, I will grant you that. Mike?

1 MR. NUSSMAN: Mr. Chairman, thank you.
2 Speaking on behalf of the snakes in the grass, let me
3 say that I think one thing that should be incumbent
4 upon us snakes is to, if we have problems, and I
5 wouldn't say - but if we do have problems, we very
6 clearly, very early in this rewrite process, make that
7 known.

8 To be frank, this document is changing. And
9 it is changing - and continues to change in fairly
10 significant ways.

11 Now, we may put it all back together and it
12 may look exactly or very similar to the original - the
13 document we walked in with. I would think is probably
14 won't look like that. Which means that people could
15 walk away from this feeling like, geeze, this thing
16 has changed pretty substantially.

17 And I don't know that that is necessarily bad
18 or good or anything else. It is just a fact.

19 So, I guess what we would - what I would ask
20 and what I would think on behalf of the snakes is that
21 if we - if we, in fact, do find problems with that, we
22 speak loudly and clearly about those snakes - excuse

1 me, about those problems and quickly so we can
2 understand what they are. And we don't show up in may
3 with those handful of problems trying to lay them all
4 out and solve them at that point.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Yes. David?

6 MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am
7 not sure if I am a snake or the grass. Which one I
8 am?

9 But I think Mike points out a very important
10 thing. And that is that this document - the draft
11 that we got and the product that is going to come out
12 after this meeting, will be I think quite
13 substantially different. And so that turnaround time
14 thing becomes very important.

15 The other thing, just thinking it through a
16 little bit, Bob Bendick is absolutely right. We have
17 spent a lot of times sometimes working these things
18 out at the last moment to get it done. And it I think
19 that is an important consideration.

20 And in my limited experience in that regard,
21 often times what you argue about the most is tone and
22 substance sometimes becomes less of the issue. So the

1 more that our document doesn't get into tone, and
2 stays more factual and professional and sticks with
3 our recommendations and findings, I think the easier
4 it is going to be to get through the process you
5 outlined to get a final product.

6 Now, that is something that, you know, I
7 would encourage you all on the executive committee,
8 that to be your responsibility in some ways.

9 Is to try and filter that tone stuff out and
10 tone it down a little bit. Make it more - you know,
11 try and make it neutral in the sense of our findings
12 and our recommendations.

13 And I think it will help us a lot. Because
14 we can all - you know, we can all check our guns at
15 the door on our particular persuasion or not.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Dry it down a little bit and
17 get rid of inflammatory words? Is this the tone?

18 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, we are alarmists.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: I mean I want to know what
20 tone is.

21 MR. BENTON: I think that we all have our
22 views of the world. And that is why there is such a

1 diverse group.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

3 MR. BENTON: And because there is a diverse
4 group, people sometimes get hung up on a particular
5 world view and the rhetoric that goes along with that,
6 as opposed to the substance of what we are saying. We
7 might all agree on sort of the substance. But the
8 spin factor becomes very important to some folks or
9 all folks.

10 So, to the degree that in your drafting you
11 can help us all dispense with that problem and focus
12 on the substance, I think it will help with the final
13 product.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right. That is good.
15 My guess would be that the tone, the alarmist stuff is
16 more prevalent in an introduction and in a conclusion,
17 rather than in the other parts of the document.

18 I mean, boy, this is a pretty dry kind of
19 thing at many points. Right? Brutal after brutal. I
20 mean where is the emotion and tone in that? Right? I
21 am asking.

22 I mean how can you get much tone in? So, I

1 think what you are saying, David, and I am not
2 discounting it, it is in a sense how we open the
3 story, how we close the story and the implications we
4 draw from it. Is that right?

5 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, if I can follow up?

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

7 MR. BENTON: Yes, I agree with that. And I
8 think this morning's exercise on that introductory
9 part helped a lot. You will see the work, the product
10 about that. Because we talked about walking a fine
11 line between the chicken little syndrome and also
12 trying to convey a sense of need and urgency.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Okay. Gil?

14 MR. RADONSKI: I just wanted to raise support
15 of what Dave just said. And just underline, as we go
16 through these things, be aware of the spin factor.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Yeah.

18 MR. RADONSKI: And that is going to be the
19 things that decides how much unanimity we have on
20 this.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right. Yeah. The
22 words we use to describe things, adjectives. Huh?

1 Watch out for adjectives. Terry?

2 MR. O'HALLORAN: I agree with - that the tone
3 is important. That we have to be careful about that.

4 But I also would suggest that - I would not
5 want to confuse tone with passion for using Tundi's
6 word.

7 When we do come up with recommendation and we
8 do have consensus, that we can have some passion for
9 advocating that. And I think that that - if we can
10 have that in our document, the Ocean Commission
11 Report, I believe had that.

12 And that came through to me. It wasn't just
13 recommendations that were bland. But they were very -
14 I could hear the passion in their writing. That this
15 is really important. We need you to pay attention to
16 it. And there is passion to it.

17 So, I think that will be important for us to
18 have some success with this, once it is published and
19 submitted.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. Other comments?
21 Okay. Well, so let's - we have an hour. Let's see
22 how far we can get on organizational things. Right?

1 Are we just going to work off our sheet of paper?

2 MS. WENZEL: Yeah, I think it would be easier,
3 just to follow along. Does everybody have a copy?

4 The group that produced this is John Ogden,
5 Gil Radonski, me and Jonathan Kelsey. And we also met
6 for a short time with the implementation group and ran
7 some ideas past them and incorporated some of their
8 comments.

9 So, what I wanted to do is just go over the
10 outline, talk about a little bit about kind of where
11 we moved things and combined things.

12 Just to start, there will be the
13 introduction. Obviously that is going to have changed.

14 Just wait a second. The introduction will have
15 changed.

16 Then this Roman numeral number two, goals and
17 objectives of a national system. And there is an
18 error below on three, where I said that that section
19 had been formerly creating a national system of MPAs.

20 Number two had been creating a national system of
21 MPAs.

22 So, what we are recommending here is that we

1 focus this section on goals, objectives and program
2 activities and summary. All of this information is in
3 here. But we would move some of the information on
4 nomination processes out to combine it with other
5 information on nominations and criteria.

6 And then section three was actually - used to
7 be called assuring administrative efficiency. And now
8 it will be called developing the national system.

9 And so here we would include general
10 principals. And here we have been asked to think
11 about incorporating stewardship and effectiveness
12 concepts, especially here but also in other places
13 throughout the document.

14 Process, which had been called procedural
15 issues. And this includes national coordination and
16 regional coordination. These are existing sections.
17 They are just not labeled as such. We propose adding
18 sub-heads, just to help people track through the
19 document.

20 And then a section on the nomination process.

21 And this is, I think, one of the biggest
22 reorganizational changes that we were suggesting. It

1 would be to add the section on MPA criteria. This is
2 a lot of the work of subcommittee one. This would
3 include table one and the footnotes and explanations
4 that accompany it.

5 We thought this was really important
6 information that was not coming through sufficiently
7 in the document.

8 The information on the nomination process and
9 adding new sites, which have some similar concepts
10 that we thought perhaps could be merged.

11 There was also a discussion with the
12 implementation group about terminology and using the
13 term new sites and the ambiguity of using that to mean
14 sites that were newly being brought into a national
15 system versus sites that were being newly created.
16 And just the need to kind of be very clear about what
17 we were talking about.

18 Other considerations. People felt that this
19 was a - a section that included a lot of different
20 concepts that might actually end up getting parceled
21 out through the document in different sections.
22 Perhaps some of it in nominations, some of it in

1 implementation, perhaps some of it in other places.

2 And there was a suggestion that perhaps a
3 couple of sentences could be added about the planning
4 process to identify priority new sites. And the
5 concept there was that this was a step that was sort
6 of implied in the document, but people didn't think it
7 was clearly stated. And that it could be sort of
8 drawn out to make it - the process a little clearer.

9 Then we proposed a section on implementation.

10 There is an existing section on implementation and
11 management that could be included. Parts of the
12 section called other considerations, parts of the
13 explanation about the regional entity and what it
14 would do. This includes things like coordination and
15 monitoring that perhaps fall more into the
16 implementation part of it than the planning or
17 nomination phase.

18 Then section five is - used to be called the
19 use and effective stewardship. We would suggest that
20 it be called promoting stewardship and measuring
21 effectiveness.

22 People noted that this is very text heavy and

1 reads a little bit different from the rest of the
2 document, long paragraphs, kind of dense. And so the
3 thought was that maybe some of these concepts could be
4 embedded in other parts of the document where they are
5 appropriate and that in other places we could sort of
6 pull out the key points. I was going to get John to
7 say this, but in bullets.

8 Just because the tone of it and the look of
9 it is so different from the rest of the document. But
10 that it would continue to address sections on
11 stewardship, effectiveness, adaptive management and a
12 summary.

13 Then the last section is currently called
14 implications. That would remain. Excuse me. And
15 then it would be followed by the glossary and the
16 references.

17 So, we welcome folks's comments. I know it
18 is kind of hard to look at this and react right away.

19 Sometimes you need a little time to go back and look
20 at what the implications are.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Gil had a question.

22 MR. RADONSKI: I would - you already have a

1 little caveat in here. But under the nomination
2 process and other considerations, you do say look for
3 ways to incorporate throughout. I would strongly urge
4 that we try and get rid of miscellaneous categories
5 like that, if at all possible. Because they are just
6 a catch-all for stuff that we don't need to deal with,
7 perhaps.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Tundi?

9 DR. AGARDY: How did you envision getting the
10 language on section c(v) on the planning process? I
11 guess I kind of assumed that the next task of this
12 committee would be to think through things like
13 planning, process for identifying sites. And it seems
14 to me incredibly controversial and a difficult topic
15 to just write a few sentences on.

16 MS. WENZEL: This came up with the
17 implementation group. And we didn't get into the
18 detail. I think the thought was to just not describe
19 what that planning process was, but to say that there
20 should be one.

21 DR. AGARDY: There should be an objective
22 process.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: David?

2 MR. BENTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 Frankly, I think that this outline is going to really
4 improve the document. I think this is going to be a
5 good step. My question to Lauren is, looking III (a),
6 the incorporate stewardship and effectiveness
7 concepts, that is additional? It doesn't replace the
8 other general principals that were identified about
9 regional and existing authorities and some of that
10 other stuff?

11 MS. WENZEL: Right. It would not replace
12 those.

13 MR. BENTON: Okay. It would be additive?
14 Okay.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Eric?

16 MR. GILMAN: I just wanted to point out what I
17 think are some critical gaps for the process portion
18 of the outline.

19 And maybe they are in the text of the
20 document and were considered to be included in some of
21 these sections. But it - some of the things we
22 identified as being critical showing here are ensuring

1 there is sustainable funding. During the process
2 ensuring there is a formalized process for state
3 involvement. The process of screening the MMAs for
4 the initial development of identifying the federal
5 MPAs, gap analysis to identify ecological gaps.
6 Performance assessment and adaptive management should
7 be part of the process, not something that should be
8 later.

9 A step for ensuring there is coordination - a
10 spirit of coordination between the components of the
11 system. Those sorts of things.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Other questions? Yes,
13 Larry?

14 MR. MALONEY: Just a couple of quick -

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry, we are going to have to
16 get you to the microphone.

17 MR. MALONEY: Just a couple of quick
18 questions. Are you going to include the
19 recommendations at the end of each of the Roman
20 numerals as appropriate, rather than all of them at
21 the end?

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: No. All of them are going to

1 be at the front, at the moment.

2 MR. MALONEY: Okay. Right now, they are the
3 executive digest -

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Ah, the executive summary at
5 the front, my thinking is ought to include the
6 recommendations. I don't want people to have to read
7 through this document to find our recommendations.

8 MR. MALONEY: I would think normally, though,
9 they are included in both places, in the executive
10 summary and in the body of the report itself.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Right. I know that.
12 Yeah. Well, we will - we will take that under
13 advisement. That is right. You are correct. The
14 reason I am wondering is does that mean then people
15 are going to read sections and not see any
16 recommendations there? So, I - this is kind of a
17 presentational sort of issue that I think has to be
18 addressed.

19 Max?

20 MR. PETERSON: Yeah. I think you do need to
21 repeat the recommendations in the body of the report.
22 You have summarized them in the executive summary.

1 But I have a bigger question. There needs to
2 be both an introduction and a background section, I
3 think, because we jump right into the goals and
4 objectives of the national system and I am wondering
5 if there even should be one.

6 Why are you even thinking about one? In
7 other words, the whole - now, you have got this
8 introduction that is being rewritten that will give
9 part of that. But I think there needs to be a few
10 breakdowns under introduction and background that
11 outlines the current situation and then the need for
12 something.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

14 MR. PETERSON: Before you jump into goals.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

16 MR. PETERSON: Because I am not even convinced
17 there should be one at this point. And you jump right
18 in to making one. Okay.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. I think that is
20 correct. You know, the word introduction is not very
21 helpful here. So, we can work on that. I mean maybe
22 this is the problem statement.

1 I guess at this point - these are good
2 comments. Sorry, I shouldn't have said at this point.

3 Yes, Larry?

4 MR. MALONEY: Just one other quick question.
5 Could you elaborate on what was - would be covered
6 under implications?

7 MS. WENZEL: That is the end, the conclusions.
8 That is the section as currently written. So, we
9 weren't proposing any changes to that.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: John?

11 DR. OGDEN: I think implications is kind of an
12 orphan in this outline. And I think it really needs
13 to be looked at again.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Since I wrote it, I
15 would be happy to sacrifice it to the gods of brevity.

16

17 DR. OGDEN: Hand of the chair.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, take it out as far as I
19 am concerned. I don't care. I have no - it is not
20 one of - something I feel strongly about.

21 Okay. Are we finished with organization?

22 Yes, Lauren?

1 MS. WENZEL: I just have one comment. I mean
2 Eric raised some points about missing steps in the
3 document having to do with process. And I think some
4 of those are in there in different places. But
5 perhaps they don't tell a logical story the way I
6 heard his description does.

7 And I guess I would just, you know, leave
8 that open to the group about - maybe in the next draft
9 about how much of that is adequately addressed and how
10 much they feel is not.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mel, Dave and Dolly.

12 MR. MOON: I know we are grappling with the
13 rewrite and the introduction about some sections that
14 are dealing with tribal issues that dealt with what
15 the system does and what the system does not do.

16 And part of our discussion in that group was
17 to come to a realization that that principal is
18 present in the existence of what is there now. And
19 the marine manage areas and the MPAs as they exist
20 now.

21 And they are also present in a national
22 system that we are proposing. The question that comes

1 to mind as we are dealing with the outline here is how
2 do we capture that, along with providing for a process
3 for the tribes to actually get support to engage in a
4 development process that would be different from
5 everything that is in here.

6 And so I just wanted to bring it out. As far
7 as the organization, we can go through the document
8 and do an assessment of where we have references. But
9 I think we may need to have a separate section by
10 itself that deals with the tribal elements. Because
11 it is not the same as a state or anything else. It
12 may require further clarification and definition.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. I have Dave and then
14 Dolly.

15 MR. BENTON: Mr. Chairman, you might want to
16 see if Dolly want to follow up. Mine is a little
17 different thing.

18 Mr. Chairman, in terms of the introduction -

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah?

20 MR. BENTON: One thing that is sort of missing
21 here is our charge. A description of our charge and
22 the charge that was put to us by the center. There

1 might be a little - you know, just a little bit to set
2 the context might not be a bad idea. And I am
3 thinking a paragraph or two, not a long thing.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I thought it was in
5 there, but okay, we will look. Yes, Dolly?

6 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess
7 I would like to start by saying to me this outline
8 flows much better. And I really appreciate the work
9 that was put into it. It just kind of looks very
10 logical to me.

11 But it is kind of hard to start - it is
12 almost like we are starting our work for May right now
13 by saying why is this here and this is there. And we
14 have made substantial changes this morning in the
15 introduction and those points that were there. So, we
16 sort of need to see the whole thing again.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

18 DR. GARZA: I do agree that we need to add the
19 recommendations in the body. In terms of what Mel had
20 stated, I did try to add here the kinds of issues you
21 brought up wherever I could. And that may not be the
22 way it works out. But it is a - you know, I - I looked

1 at this and I went, yahoo.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. On that happy note, we
3 are moving on. Can we move on? Lauren, do you know
4 what we have to do?

5 MS. WENZEL: From this?

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: On all this?

7 MS. WENZEL: Yes.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Okay. Glad you do.

9 MS. WENZEL: Just don't ask me.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Just don't ask you? All right.
11 Implementation? Are we ready for a brief report on
12 that?

13 MS. GLACKIN: Yes, I can give that. And I
14 think it will flow kind of nicely on this because as
15 Lauren alluded to, we did meet with her at the end.

16 And as a group, we felt much more comfortable
17 with this outline because we had recognized that we
18 really had a lot of overlap between the new site
19 section and the nomination process.

20 We did make the explicit or had an explicit
21 discussion that, as they are combined here, that they
22 were written from two different perspectives. And the

1 nomination process came from that aspect of
2 stewardship. And we need to not lose that and not
3 turn it into just a very procedural thing.

4 But the other thing that we noted is while we
5 think this outline is a lot better and this kind of
6 gets on the point that Lauren and Eric have made here,
7 is it is still not clear yet that we have identified
8 all the steps to ensure we are where we need to be.

9 And, Tundi, this is what kind of caused this
10 thing here. It would probably be better to say add
11 sentences on the need for a planning process to ID the
12 sites. That that was something that, you know, didn't
13 seem to be there at this point. So, it will be
14 something we will need to look through as we go to the
15 next one.

16 The second point that I want to make has to
17 do with criteria. And, if you recollect when I spoke
18 this morning, we talked about criteria to get into the
19 network.

20 We had a good discussion on that. And it
21 really kind of boiled down to the fact that we had a
22 lot of discussion about, well, do you set criteria.

1 And, if you do, where do you set them. And, you know,
2 do sites ever get into this system because we have so
3 few sites that really meet the criteria that I think
4 some of us at least would like to see them meet in
5 terms of monitoring and enforcement and such
6 management.

7 So, what we kind of came to, and I think this
8 is for the larger group's consideration here, was how
9 we actually get this off the ground is that the
10 federal sites that meet the criteria that are laid out
11 here really form the nucleus of this. And possibly
12 don't even go through any kind of nomination process
13 because they are federal.

14 And then there is the nomination processes we
15 have laid out here. But once you are in the system,
16 the need to - and I think that the words are there,
17 they might need to be tweaked a little bit, the
18 continual review and evaluation to encourage sites to
19 become more effective.

20 And we had a lot of discussion about how you
21 make this happen with the bottom line being that you
22 need to make it happen with carrots as opposed to

1 sticks to do that. That it takes some amount of
2 resources to do that.

3 So, I think, you know, some of these - you
4 know, we obviously don't have words to offer right
5 here now because of things shifting right now. And I
6 think that it will take a - kind of a double check
7 through again as we see a new draft to make sure these
8 comments get addressed in there.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. Are there comments
10 for this part? Bob?

11 MR. BENDICK: I just have a question, Mary.
12 What would be the sort of range of federal sites
13 already in the system as you described it?

14 MS. GLACKIN: Well, I think the idea, and I
15 might ask Charlie to back me up here, is that we would
16 use the criteria that are in the document right now
17 for differentiating between an MMA and an MPA.

18 So, for example, the marine sanctuaries would
19 fall into the MPA category. And they would form the
20 nucleus. Do you want to say more on that, Charlie?

21 MR. WAHLE: Let me get the microphone close to
22 my mouth here. Yeah, that is basically that we are

1 thinking one way to approach this is you have a set of
2 definitional criteria that set a standard for what is
3 an MPA. And then you develop other - more operational
4 criteria to distinguish among the MPAs within the
5 system for the purposes of incentives and advances and
6 improvement and that kind of thing.

7 MR. MOON: Charlie, can't hear you.

8 MR. WAHLE: Even closer? Okay. So, yes, what
9 she said. That there would be the definitional
10 criteria that subcommittee one developed or something
11 like it. It would be the initial filter for what is
12 or is not an MPA.

13 The federal sites in one vision would just -
14 that would be applied to them. And those that meet it
15 are in the system. And then the state sites, there
16 would be some sort of nomination, a voluntary process
17 which applies the same criteria, but it is on a
18 voluntary basis.

19 So, in the end, what you would end up with in
20 the initial cut of the federal sites is probably most
21 if not all marine sanctuaries, all national parks,
22 most refuges, that kind of thing.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Max?

2 MR. PETERSON: This is probably a legal
3 question. But I don't know that there is authority to
4 change an MMA into an MPA or to change a national park
5 area that may be called something else into MPA. I
6 think that required maybe some legal research.

7 But I don't know that there is any authority
8 to suddenly say that we have changed this into
9 something called an MPA. That is something you
10 probably need to look at and maybe get an opinion of
11 somebody.

12 But I don't know that there is any authority
13 to do that. And I am not sure you want to.

14 I think there would be some - some concern
15 for the kind of things that become the first MPAs.
16 Theoretically, they ought to include some state sites
17 and some other sites, so it doesn't look like that the
18 whole thing is a federalized system.

19 Just a little bit of a caution. Little bit
20 of a suggestion to take a reality check on when you
21 suddenly announce this as a national system MPAs.
22 Okay?

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. These are things we can
2 check out and work out. Is that correct?

3 MR. PETERSON: Yeah, I don't think this group
4 -

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not the place to -

6 MR. PETERSON: No. But I think I need to
7 raise that red flag.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree. I agree. Okay. So,
9 we have Mark and we have Bob. And then I would like
10 to move us on. So, Mark?

11 DR. HIXON: Just a point of clarification. In
12 the outline, Roman number III(c)(I), and it is listed
13 MPA criteria (Table 1), the MPA criteria actually
14 includes the entire EO definition of MPA. And the
15 definitions of all the key words in that definition.

16 Table 1 refers only to the definition of
17 lasting. Thank you.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Thank, Mark. Bob
19 Bendick?

20 MR. BENDICK: Well, just one other question on
21 the sort of stuff going into the system. In the case
22 of a new federal - my understanding of where we are in

1 this process, in the case of a potential new federal
2 MPA, like a new marine sanctuary, it would have to
3 follow the procedures set out in existing authorities.

4 But it would also have to follow - to become
5 a - accepted into the national system, it would also
6 have to follow the procedures we have set out here.
7 Is that correct?

8 MS. GLACKIN: I think so. I think so. I
9 don't - we are getting caught I think a little bit.
10 You know, I like the suggestion of let us go back and
11 look at our authorities and things like that. I don't
12 think we have a problem. But I think it needs to be
13 looked at closer.

14 MR. BENDICK: The reason I am asking this and
15 follows on in Mack's thing is that I think, you know,
16 part of what we are trying to achieve here is
17 protected areas where different levels of government
18 and entities work together to take ownership of them.

19 And I think we need to be cautious about
20 federal things coming into the system, having - being
21 treated somehow differently than stuff nominated by
22 other entities or state things. So that we uphold

1 this idea of partnership and not - not a different
2 standard. And I just think we need to look at that a
3 little bit more.

4 MS. GLACKIN: I think that is a real good
5 point.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Yeah. Okay. Let's do
7 that. Thank you.

8 Okay. Can we move to a preliminary
9 consideration? Joe?

10 MR. URAVITCH: Yeah. This is in response to
11 what Bob just said. I would just make the point that
12 the executive order directs federal agencies to do
13 this. Whereas, for the states, it is a voluntary
14 process. And I think what they are talking about
15 recognizes that.

16 I do understand your concern about whether we
17 are treating different governmental entities in a
18 different way. But right now, that is how things are
19 structured through the executive order. And the
20 question is whether that ought to be the case or not.

21 So, maybe that is one of the issues that needs to be
22 addressed by this group.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We will work on that.
2 Okay. Would you allow us to take a preliminary look
3 at what might be an executive summary and some
4 recommendations?

5 This - we will take the cap off the projector
6 here and reveal it to you for the first time. What -
7 a small group of us met up here at the end of the day
8 yesterday for a little bit. And have created a
9 possible set of categories and placeholders. And that
10 is all they are.

11 So, what I would like to do would be just to
12 walk through it very briefly with you. And maybe
13 spend five or ten minutes on it at most. And then we
14 need to switch to this.

15 But I would like to lay out for you is some
16 categories of summary statements and recommendations.

17 So, that is what this is. Please look at it with
18 that in light.

19 The executive summary would start with
20 something like what is the problem. Now, in a sense
21 maybe we would get rid of the headings. But this is,
22 again, just placeholder stuff.

1 What is the problem? Habitat degradation,
2 declining fish stocks, multiple claims and claimants
3 on marine habitats. Are these the right placeholders?

4 Let me go through it and then we will come
5 back. Okay?

6 What can be done? A national system marine
7 managed areas. I finessed the language here a little
8 bit, but okay.

9 How would it be accomplished? There would be
10 a nomination process, stakeholder participation, blah,
11 blah, blah. There would be criteria for inclusion in
12 the system and expulsion, i.e., if performance
13 standards aren't met.

14 Let's see. How would it relate to other
15 efforts? We might have two statements in there about
16 it is just a tool that fits in with other things that
17 are going on.

18 Must be coordinated with federal, state,
19 territorial and tribal entities.

20 How would it be funded? Congressional
21 appropriations or an ocean trust fund. If you don't
22 want to mention that second thing, that is fine.

1 What are the performance measures and
2 sanctions? Evidence of stabilization of declining
3 systems. Evidence of recovery of stocks and habitats
4 and administrative efficiency. Sort of is it
5 administratively coherent.

6 So, those are thirteen possible summary
7 points from our report. There may be others. You may
8 not like these. We can go back and I will do that
9 right now.

10 But then the second piece I think might be a
11 recommendations of which at the moment I have only
12 five. That there be some sort of national system.
13 But, you know, that is sort of an executive order.
14 Maybe we don't want to recommend that.

15 But a national system, secure funding,
16 specific criteria for inclusions, clear decision
17 authority and coordination. Bob Zales's point about
18 who is the boss. And something about performance.

19 So, maybe we would have sort of thirteen
20 items in an executive summary and five
21 recommendations. So, I will go back to the top and
22 you tell me what you want to do. Larry?

1 MR. MALONEY: One thing I noticed, and there
2 seems to be a dichotomy here in that we talk about
3 MPAs in one place being a tool, yet on the other hand
4 we talk about criteria for admission to the system,
5 possible expulsion. And those two concepts just don't
6 seem to match up to me.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: But -

8 MR. MALONEY: You know, we talk about
9 performance evaluation. That is something you would
10 do of a tool. So -

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point here is that
12 there are other tools, if we may use that word, there
13 are other tools and processes ongoing. And now here
14 is another tool that comes in. And there are some
15 criteria in a sense to let that be admitted to the set
16 of tools. And that is what the criteria do. And they
17 may become complimentary to that other tool - the
18 tools in the tool kit or not. I think that - isn't
19 that what we mean by this?

20 Okay. I have Tony and Gil and - oh, Tony, I
21 guess you were on my list already and Bob.

22 DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just

1 from those categories that you put up in the executive
2 summary, I personally do not like the idea of having a
3 discussion about expulsion from a system that we are
4 trying to create.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: I can't hear you.

6 DR. CHATWIN: I don't think we should be
7 talking about expulsion of a system that we are trying
8 to -

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Excommunication. Let's use
10 that word.

11 DR. CHATWIN: No, I don't think so. I think
12 that -

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: But there has been -

14 DR. CHATWIN: Take Larry's point, Mr.
15 Chairman, that if it is a tool and it is not working
16 well, we have got to address it and fix it.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

18 DR. CHATWIN: Expulsion -

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: I know.

20 DR. CHATWIN: To me is just - anyway. And the
21 other thing is, when you talk about performance
22 measures -

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah?

2 DR. CHATWIN: They - I think performance
3 measures, the discussion of performance measures is
4 that it should be goal-specific. The performance
5 measures should be related to the goals.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

7 DR. CHATWIN: And the examples that you have
8 up there are very natural heritage - related to
9 natural heritage goals.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

11 DR. CHATWIN: So, we should have a more - a
12 broader discussion, rather than the specific criteria.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: No, that is good. That is fine.

14 Yeah, expulsion, I mean we had had some discussions
15 about de-listing or something. I don't really know.

16 But the point is here is if we have some
17 criteria for becoming one, and if you are not doing
18 what it was you said you were going to do, then what
19 happens. Right? I mean that was your point. We need
20 to fix it.

21 DR. CHATWIN: Right. And the discussion we
22 had in the implementation group was that I think the

1 challenge would be to find incentives to make the
2 system work better as a whole. Think of ways of
3 making an elite club.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. That is right. I think
5 there was also - maybe they succeed so well that they
6 can be de-listed or taken off the list. And I think
7 that was part of what we had in mind here.

8 Okay, Gil?

9 MR. RADONSKI: When you quickly went through
10 it, Mr. Chairman, it almost appeared to me like the
11 national system was the answer. It started out with
12 problems and then you quickly, the next one -

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

14 MR. RADONSKI: And I have concerns about that.
15 Because when this process is done, if we are
16 successful in creating a national system, there will
17 still be many, many MPAs, MMAs outside the national
18 system.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely. Yeah.

20 MR. RADONSKI: So, I have a little concern
21 about that.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: No, that is right. That is

1 right. A systematic approach to this thing is what?

2 MR. RADONSKI: Well, I think getting it in
3 context is correct because we - on the first screen
4 you talked about declining fish populations. We could
5 have a discussion of the role of MPAs in solving that
6 problem.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right.

8 MR. RADONSKI: And, again, that falls back to
9 the management tool aspect of MPAs.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. We will have
11 other cracks at this. I have Gil - I have got Bob
12 Bendick and then Bob -

13 MR. BENDICK: This tries to speak to something
14 David Benton said before. I am a little concerned
15 that the executive summary seems to be raising new
16 issues like expulsion. It is not something we have
17 talked about.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry. Please. I am
19 sorry.

20 MR. BENDICK: But -

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: But we have already dealt with
22 expulsion.

1 MR. BENDICK: But the larger point is, you get
2 into trouble in these things when the executive
3 summary departs in any meaningful way in format or
4 recommendations from the full report. Because that is
5 where people get really nervous about spin and
6 context. And it is - even if it is going to be a
7 little dry, it has to track the full report. Or we
8 are -

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Look, I am very sorry.
10 I will apologize for the fourth time. Expulsion
11 should not have appeared there. We have spent - I
12 believe we have spent a lot of time on criteria for
13 inclusion. Have we not? So, forgive me. There is
14 something about if they have succeeded so much, then
15 maybe they can be pulled out of the system. If they
16 haven't succeeded, what do we do to fix them? That is
17 sort of what I was getting at here.

18 Max? Well, wait. I have Bob Bendick. I
19 have Mike - I have Bob Zales.

20 MR. BENDICK: No. That is all. The expulsion
21 wasn't the point. The point was the executive summary
22 not departing from the full report in any meaningful

1 way.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. I am happy I didn't - I
3 am happy to learn where other points in the executive
4 summary do that.

5 DR. OGDEN: Well, you did this last night and
6 we have redone the outline. And I think what Bob is
7 saying that you need to probably revisit the order -

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: We will. We will.

9 DR. OGDEN: So that it reflects the document.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: We will. That is right. Mike
11 Cruickshank and then Bob Zales.

12 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Fishing is not my major
13 field. But I was surprised that you had there habitat
14 degradation and you didn't mention over-fishing?

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I thought number two
16 sort of addressed that. I can see it is a mistake to
17 bring this up now. Why don't we just stop now. Okay?

18 DR. PEREYRA: I have a point to the expulsion.
19 Because we have discussed that over time. And part
20 of the rationale for including it in there, there
21 could be a natural disaster. You could have an MPA
22 set up and established to do something to protect a

1 certain type of habitat.

2 And you can have a hurricane Ivan. You could
3 have tsunami somewhere. They could come in and
4 totally take out that habitat. There would be no
5 reason to continue to have an MPA for an area that
6 didn't have anything to do what it was going to do.

7 And if you didn't have a mechanism to take it
8 out, it would be there in perpetuity and it wouldn't
9 necessarily need to be.

10 And the point you made about it could be that
11 these things have done everything it was intended to
12 do. It is not going to do anything any better than
13 that. And it is not necessary to include that
14 anymore. You could do that.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks.

16 DR. PEREYRA: And it could also be that you
17 could have an area that you had a goal set and a
18 mechanism in place to establish and do certain things
19 that just physically or any other way cannot be done.
20 And there has to be a way to take that out.

21 And part of the discussion was, because when
22 this eventually gets to the public, you are going to

1 have some people say, well, if these things aren't
2 necessary, how do you take them out. And there needs
3 to be that mechanism.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: And this is not a new point.
5 We have discussed it. But I realize this is
6 premature. I quit.

7 Let's go on to the charts. I - we will come
8 back to this. I don't want to fight with anybody.
9 You may think I enjoy it, but I don't. So, let's
10 quit. Let's look at this stuff. Okay?

11 Maybe we can agree on this. I am going to go
12 up here and Lauren is going to take notes or
13 something. But in a sense, somebody asked. And who
14 has this beautiful blue handwriting. Okay. Brian.
15 All right.

16 So, all the blue beautiful handwriting is
17 Brian. We want to know who made points, we can get
18 back to them if we have to.

19 So, Brian wants this mentioned in the
20 introduction. Duly noted. No dispute.

21 Creating a national system, rephrase some -
22 okay, so that is some particular wording stuff.

1 He wanted included memorandum of agreement,
2 and other binding agreements there. Any contentious
3 stuff here? I mean some of these are good points that
4 don't require much discussion. Some of them do.

5 MS. WENZEL: You may need to read some of
6 them, Dan, people can't read this.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: You can't read? The first one
8 is rephrase subverted by external threats. Add
9 participatory research to the glossary. Also include
10 memorandum of agreement on page ten. Who knows where
11 that is now. And other binding agreements.

12 DR. MELZIAN: In reference to that, there are
13 a couple of key points. MOAs have been mentioned and
14 MOUs, but there are also other types of binding
15 agreements. And if you go on a Google or go
16 elsewhere, there is distinct differences in some
17 people's minds between an MOA and an MOU.

18 So, I suggest perhaps include both, an MOU or
19 other binding agreements.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Here is potential
21 examples of sustainable sources of funding. That is
22 nice. I mean suggestions.

1 Now, here is some nice green writing. TEK --
2 Dolly, this is you. Right. I think - Bonnie? Do we
3 have TEKs sort of taken care of? Or we will have it
4 taken care of?

5 DR. McCAY: We will. Dolly will -

6 DR. GARZA: Mostly, Mr. Chair - mostly, Mr.
7 Chair, I have added sort of TEK throughout to make
8 sure it is in there. So, that is almost all of what I
9 did.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: And nobody objects to that.
11 Page seven, who or what is causing - adding new sites,
12 government to government dialogue with affected tribes
13 for treaty and for EO - residential order, 1538. So,
14 we can find that. You know, this is just to cover our
15 tracks, I think, neatly and procedurally.

16 Line 181 or 198. The idea that the MPA might
17 benefit the marine environment or MPAs of an adjacent
18 nation. Is this still you, Dolly, or is this a new
19 green pen?

20 DR. SUMAN: No, that was me.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Dan? What is this?

22 DR. SUMAN: We mentioned many times in the

1 document that we have added language that mentions
2 international aspects turn to national issues. But I
3 wish that some place we would mention the issue that
4 an MPA - that an MPA might serve a regional function,
5 international function and not specifically a US
6 function.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: But - okay, to be clear about
8 this one, it would be hard without some extraordinary
9 things, it would be hard to create it for that
10 purpose. It might be an additional benefit of that.
11 That could probably not be a purpose of a federal
12 action to knowingly and on purpose benefit. Okay? Is
13 that right, Dan?

14 So, we would want to recognize these thing
15 that happen, but it would not be a criteria.

16 DR. SUMAN: Okay. Or recognize that there are
17 additional benefits to some sites.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. All right. And this
19 also you, I think, Dan. What are annealing
20 algorithms. You don't know what those are?

21 DR. SUMAN: No, I don't.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Who does? Whose beautiful

1 language is this? Never mind. Annealing algorithms.

2 I am with you, Dan.

3 All right. Who is red? Oh, Mark. Okay.

4 Insert after plans each of which is designed to meet
5 the same specific goals. Mark? Is that -

6 DR. HIXON: Yeah, that is just to clarify on
7 page seven, line 289, that we are talking about
8 equivalent alternative plans. And once we have set
9 those up, using annealing algorithms, then the next
10 step is minimizing the impacts.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Okay. Thank you.
12 Administrative efficiency. Do you know what? I think
13 we should stop because we do have an important speaker
14 at noon and people want a break. So, we are going to
15 stop it right here and pick this up after lunch.
16 Yeah, and come regard these and -

17 MS. WENZEL: Lunch is coming into us here at
18 twelve.

19 MR. CONNAUGHTON: I will open it up.

20 MR. RADONSKI: I was the one who raised the
21 question of how many times MPA appeared versus MMAs.
22 And going through the report, through your report,

1 MPAs was mentioned once and MMAs twenty-two times.

2 Just wondering, do you see a difference? Are
3 you - can we lump them together? How can - how should
4 we deal with them?

5 MR. CONNAUGHTON: No, actually, my point is a
6 marine protected area is an essential tool of marine
7 management. But there are many other facets to these
8 water systems we are going to be working with. You
9 know, the non-protected areas.

10 And so what is happening is - what I see in
11 the political and cultural dialogue, the exclusive
12 focus on marine protected areas, which is critical
13 because there was none before, has now moved to the
14 front. And the people talking about marine protected
15 areas are forgetting that there is a whole swath of
16 activity that we are not talking about for protection.

17 And so that is where the plots come.

18 So, what we have said is, no, we need to good
19 marine management strategies, like we have land
20 management strategies, of which this is an essential
21 tool.

22 Now, when I talk to people that way, they go,

1 oh, oh, you are not talking about locking up the
2 entire ocean and putting it off limits to the body of
3 politic. It just changes the dialogue. I
4 can't tell you. I save hours of discussion when I
5 start with we are talking about effective marine
6 management and we need to find ways to preserve that
7 which matters most.

8 And people say, okay, we can work with you on
9 that. So, that is all. It is just a way of
10 approaching the issue.

11 You all are the marine protect - you know,
12 you are the MPA people. And so I hope you are looking
13 through that lens of the telescope. You should be.
14 And then I am looking from the other side. I am
15 looking where you fit in the broader. And I want to
16 make sure you have a central place in that
17 conversation.

18 That is the ultimate point. We have to
19 understand that. Because conservation is critical.
20 These nurseries, these habitats, the vital spaces are
21 critical to protect. Which is why I was elated with
22 the Alaska and the deep corals. I mean who would have

1 think it even five years ago that they would have been
2 able to pull that off. Right? And the deep coral
3 protection and the agreement they got. It took years,
4 you know, for this invisible - you know, seemingly
5 invisible issue and outcome. But that is the kind of
6 thing we want to inspire. People get it. They go, oh
7 yeah, okay. I understand that I save some and then I
8 can access others. I get it. That is good. I can
9 work with you on that.

10 MR. RADONSKI: Thank you.

11 MR. URAVITCH: Okay, Jim?

12 DR. RAY: With the broad range recommendations
13 in The Oceans Commission report, the recommendations
14 and the action plan, and at the same time with the
15 increasing budget pressures squeezing down on
16 Congressional budgets, we are talking about
17 significant increases in the cost of managing our
18 oceans. How are we going to do it from a financial
19 standpoint? Because all of that are big ticket items?

20 MR. CONNAUGHTON: We are going to do it
21 through a portfolio of resources and actions is how we
22 are going to do it. And I have worked on a number of

1 - actually, not quite as complex, but quite complex
2 areas where the resource issues comes up.

3 We tend in Washington and we tend in these
4 federal process to fixate exclusively on the federal
5 budget. And that is important.

6 But what we are talking about is actually
7 organizing, and I use that word organizing, we are
8 actually talking about organizing billions and
9 billions of dollars of activity, beyond just the
10 federal tax payer side of this equation.

11 Because we are talking about marine transport
12 through sensitive areas. We are talking about new
13 port design. We are talking about recreational -
14 creating a management structure that allows for
15 enhanced recreational opportunities and all the
16 economic value that close from that and the private
17 sector dollars that go to enable that.

18 So, while the federal budget is critical, we
19 can't stop there. And let me tell you, one of the
20 things that I - one of the greatest frustrations I
21 find in Washington is, as we talk about how important
22 the federal budget is, it is also the case when there

1 is a prospect of federal funding, what I see - and I
2 ask you to reflect on yourself, is all of a sudden at
3 the state and local level, they stop doing anything
4 until there is a federal decision.

5 And what we have to do is we have to actually
6 demand public funding and resources and planning in
7 conjunction with private funding and resources and
8 planning. And demand a portfolio of action.

9 I can give you examples. It drives me nuts
10 when something could have been done at the local level
11 and they just waited. They waited four years until
12 Congress decided to give them a earmark or not. And
13 then they don't get the earmark. And then everyone is
14 moaning. And then it is five years later at the local
15 level. We have to get out of that loop.

16 Now, specifically on the federal budget, we
17 are spending more on oceans and ocean-related
18 activities than ever before. Does it - is it less
19 than the total portfolio of what the Oceans Commission
20 has given us? Yes.

21 But to get from here to there, working with
22 the five hundred plus members of the federal

1 government board of directors, the US Congress,
2 increasingly there is an insistence that you define a
3 specific management strategy, you define specific
4 resources necessary to pull it off and then and only
5 then can you make the case to get the funding you
6 need. They don't write big blank checks anymore.

7 And so one of the things we are focused on
8 the science side is this direction from the Commission
9 as to set a ten year research strategy. Because when
10 I look at NOAA's budget as one fifth of the issue, and
11 I see the priorities that NOAA's management sets, and
12 then I see the earmarks that Congress imposes, they
13 are out of synch with each other.

14 Now, the researchers that got the earmarks,
15 you know, God bless them. You know, great, you got
16 them. But some of them are way out of synch with the
17 priorities that we ourselves would agree are
18 priorities. Okay? And we have to find a way to get -
19 to evolve that. We will never eliminate that dynamic.

20 But to further evolve that to at least, if there is
21 going to be ear marks for Congress, the earmarks are
22 going toward our agreed priorities. Even if it is

1 going to get done in - a major piece of ocean research
2 is going to get done in West Virginia.

3 So, let's make sure at least the money is
4 going toward things that we collectively think are the
5 highest priority.

6 If you look at the portfolio that the Ocean
7 Commission has given us, I mean it is huge. And you
8 have to set priorities from within that. Right?

9 And that is why your work is so critical to
10 us. This report you are working on that will come out
11 in the spring is going to be very important.

12 And you should be pleased. You know, you are
13 actually - I think unlike three years ago or six years
14 ago, this report is going to find its way into an
15 active process.

16 So, you know, you can be very well assured
17 that the report is going to be integrated into a bunch
18 of people that are going to have to address it, think
19 through it, see what they like about it, see what they
20 don't like about it, but make decisions based on it.
21 You know, that is - so, I hope you find strength in
22 that.

1 MR. URAVITCH: Okay, Rod, you were next on the
2 list.

3 DR. FUJITA: Thank you. I really appreciate
4 your commitment to action, as opposed to description.
5 And I think a lot of us around this table share that
6 commitment.

7 You are articulated two top line priorities
8 for the President. One being the improvement of
9 fisheries management and the other one being to raise
10 the visibility and protection of coral reefs.

11 Can you give us examples of specific actions
12 that you might have in mind to address those two top
13 priorities?

14 MR. CONNAUGHTON: On the fisheries piece, you
15 know, Manguson-Stevens is coming up. We took a run at
16 it before. But I think it will and must happen this
17 time around. And so very specifically we are going to
18 have a pretty intensive legislative dialogue.

19 At the same time, we are going to stand up
20 these regional efforts so that that federal
21 legislative dialogue can be received and worked on and
22 actually get some ownership at the local level.

1 So, I could go into lots of our ideas for how
2 we do that. But they are only our ideas. We want
3 this to be a shared exercise.

4 Cameron is spending a ton of time with the
5 coastal states folks. And interestingly, and you all
6 can help with this. You know, they keep saying well
7 what do you want to do. And we keep trying to
8 explain, well, actually, we have set this up where we
9 are going to welcome your suggestions, too.

10 And it is a little bit of a - so, we need you
11 to tell us what would work best for you. And we want
12 - so, we are going to create this expectation. And,
13 of course, you know, ED will come in and give us all
14 the solutions. So, that is one.

15 On the coral reefs piece, a small down
16 payment was being sure we got the funding. And we
17 need, by the way - we may need your help on that in
18 the budget process, for the local action strategies.
19 Because we really see that as a bottoms up. It is so
20 sellable when you have a local actions, that the folks
21 have committed to that. And I can go to the Hill and
22 show that the private sector dollars and the county

1 community dollars, I have all the freedom in the world
2 that the hammer on the people I deal with on the Hill
3 to say, well, wait a minute, they are putting their
4 piece in, this is supposed to be partnership,
5 shouldn't you.

6 But Congress is increasingly assisting on
7 that. Leveraging partnerships. So, that is very small
8 down-payment.

9 We then have the regulatory side, which, you
10 know, some things about Alaska on the deep corals,
11 because it was done by the regional council, rather
12 than done from our friends a NOAA for example.

13 And if we can replicate that very
14 aggressively. You know, we know the areas. We know
15 them. Right? They are pretty well identified.

16 We know the practices. I think in
17 combination with creating regional strategies around
18 those protection efforts, and then working with the
19 expertise of possible regulatory authority of NOAA, we
20 can step function forward there.

21 It is also the case that we have - I don't
22 know if any of you have heard of the white water to

1 blue water partnerships, brand new participants in
2 that. How many of you were down in Miami for the
3 white water and blue water?

4 Well, let me give you something that - you
5 guys should ask for a small briefing on that. We have
6 the Caribbean nations with us in Miami last year, as a
7 follow-up commitment coming out of the world summit on
8 sustainable development in Johannesburg.

9 There were several hundred people there. And
10 the agenda was set up so that a significant portion of
11 each evening was in a room about this size with round
12 tables. And it was called - it was a partnership
13 fair. It was a partnership fair.

14 So, rather than sort of get the classic
15 presentations and sit around a table like this, they
16 did that through the course of the day. But the
17 couple of hours in the evening were spent with
18 cocktails. Very important. Of partnerships.

19 And the way they set it up was, if you formed
20 a partnership in the room, you would raise you hand
21 and shout that you have got one.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we call that an

1 annealing algorithm.

2 MR. CONNAUGHTON: There you go. And it was
3 very funny because, as reported to me, I was not able
4 to make it, but I got - when I talked to the officials
5 that were down there, it started off like your high
6 school mixer. Right? You know? Everyone started out
7 wall flowers.

8 And before too long, there was a - created an
9 energy. Because only the expectation is to find
10 people of a common goal and see how you can align your
11 resources and your activities. And that was the
12 reason for the cocktail conversations.

13 And then there was an expectation when you
14 got one that you would - and then they wrote them
15 down. And they are doing follow-up on it.

16 But it became infectious. It became
17 infectious. I haven't seen anything like that in my
18 time in government or even outside of government.

19 But that is the next piece. If you ask me,
20 it is how we find more of these fora to create these
21 strategies, but around which is a commitment, not just
22 a discussion of the problem. But around which there

1 is specific commitments.

2 Now, my view is, out of this White Water Blue
3 Water partnership exercise, lets say for example, I
4 forget what the number was, but there were several
5 dozen. Well, if even half of them succeed, that is
6 ten times more than when we started.

7 And then I think we have to - that is the
8 kind of approach we have to take. Especially on
9 things like corals. Because there is lots of
10 different affected interests.

11 So, those are some examples. I could go on
12 and on. But time is short.

13 MR. URAVITCH: John?

14 DR. OGDEN: Thanks very much for coming and
15 giving us such a stimulating set of remarks. It is
16 very, very energizing.

17 While it is true that the ocean is different
18 from the land, it is significant that protected areas
19 have probably more similarities than differences as
20 applied in each of those quite different areas. And
21 that is one thing I think we have all recognized.

22 The other thing that seems to me to be

1 similar is that human conflicts, which we regulate by
2 a broader category of the MPA, that is zoning on land,
3 are very - indeed, very similar, and similarly,
4 destructive in the ocean.

5 And I guess we had a talk yesterday about the
6 NRC panel and its approach in a broader sense to the
7 spacial management of the ocean. And I just wondered,
8 within the context of your thinking about - and the
9 COP report approached this as well, broader aspects of
10 sort of what one might call spacial management or,
11 dare I say, zoning of the ocean.

12 MR. CONNAUGHTON: And I say tomato, you say
13 tomato. I say marine management. Right. So, it is
14 all terminology. But it is all the same basket of
15 issues.

16 I think that is where we are going. Right?
17 Isn't that what this is about? From land management
18 to coastal zone management and now we are going to
19 marine management.

20 Law of the sea is a critical component of
21 that. And I hope, you know, finally this year - I
22 know Senator Lugar is ready to tee it up in a couple

1 of weeks. I hope we will finally get that through.

2 And so I guess I would say yes, and yes and
3 yes. So, that is where we need to go. We have to
4 construct a conversation so they are culturally
5 relevant in the regions we are dealing with, because
6 each of them is different. But that is where we are
7 going.

8 Now, I am looking forward - the overlook
9 piece of this is the power of our true color, three
10 dimensional technology that is now accessible to your
11 average Joe fishing in his small little boat. And
12 that is going to change things.

13 I mean everybody has got them now. You know,
14 we are getting out of black and white into color.
15 Everyone is now - you know, within our reach is
16 everyone having a 3-D imaging of the marine
17 experience. Right? Scuba divers already enjoy it?
18 Right? All the cameras and things we do.

19 But everybody is going to have a 3-D
20 experience with their inter-relationship with the
21 marine systems. And then if we can begin to network
22 those data sets, it is going to be extremely powerful.

1 With the advent of technology, that kind of
2 technology, it is going to open a lot of eyes and
3 create - just as going into the unexplored west
4 created vistas of economic opportunity but also
5 protection and conservation opportunities, I think it
6 is only with the advent of this technology that we
7 will be able to really unleash the personal
8 enthusiasms that will help.

9 It will help people understand, too, and make
10 use of management strategies. You know, zoning type
11 strategies.

12 MR. URAVITCH: Okay. Tony and then Mike.

13 MR. CONNAUGHTON: And then I think I have got
14 to bug out of here.

15 DR. CHATWIN: Okay. Thank you very much. I
16 am delighted with the stated commitment to sustainable
17 fisheries and to improvement of marine management
18 areas.

19 One thing I noticed in the action plan,
20 though, is that - and I am hoping this isn't - but I
21 just wanted to bring attention to this. It is that in
22 the section of improving marine managed areas,

1 National Fisheries Services is not specifically
2 mentioned here. And they have - and they probably are
3 in - under pages --

4 MR. CONNAUGHTON: Is NOAA there?

5 DR. CHATWIN: Yeah, but -

6 MR. CONNAUGHTON: Well, we bundled all
7 together.

8 DR. CHATWIN: But in the opportunity of -
9 provides also an opportunity to further both of your
10 stated objectives here. National Fisheries Service
11 also has jurisdiction over marine managed areas.

12 MR. CONNAUGHTON: There is no question we
13 contemplated that. We just used NOAA to capture a
14 whole range of activities.

15 So, we didn't call out in any of these items
16 separate sub-agencies unless we had to. So, yes.
17 Unquestionably.

18 And I have to tell you that because I didn't
19 - Dan Bausta would take away my certification. So -

20 DR. CHATWIN: Like that is a great area for
21 the council to provide some input and help the
22 coordination of those sister agencies.

1 MR. CONNAUGHTON: Let me use that as an
2 opportunity. I went down to dedicate the eco
3 discovery center down in the Keys. And I look forward
4 to going back down when they set up that - the
5 construction is done on the new office where all the
6 management agencies are going to be in the same place.

7 And so finally the government action will be
8 about what they are managing, not about their diverse
9 lines of authority. We need to do a lot more of that.
10

11 By the way, we do have a land side. There is
12 an inter-agency fire center in Idaho that is an
13 incredibly effectively functioning institution.
14 Because they broke down their jurisdictional barriers.

15 They are set up with one. They get the same
16 data. They get the same information. They know what
17 the common issues are.

18 And then they just immediately zero in and
19 deploy. Okay, who has got the authority, who has got
20 the assets, who can go where.

21 It is - you know, that is a lot of what we
22 can replicate in some of these diverse jurisdictional

1 ecosystems. So, again, I will just underscore strong
2 agreement with your point.

3 MR. URAVITCH: Okay, Mike Nussman and then we
4 are going to have to wrap it up. Thank you.

5 MR. NUSSMAN: Good, I got the last question.
6 As you stated that the Ocean Commission was a lot of
7 material and very difficult to get through. And even
8 the pieces on marine protected areas for us, as an
9 advisory committee, is difficult to put our hands
10 around.

11 With that understanding, let me - my question
12 is, to your vision of what comes out of this, do you
13 believe we see significant new legislation come out of
14 this? That comes from the administration or Congress
15 develops?

16 And I am particularly asking that question
17 with regard to the marine protected area, marine
18 managed area concept. Where are we going with that?
19 Where do you think we are going? Five years from now,
20 in your crystal ball, what would you see?

21 MR. CONNAUGHTON: Well, if I could do that, I
22 wouldn't be in government, I would be in the stock

1 market.

2 The - first of all, yes, I do see substantial
3 new legislation coming out. I think it will best come
4 out if we approach it piecemeal. That is my own view.

5 I have found in the last fifteen years of
6 watching Congress comprehensive anything doesn't
7 happen. And all it does is delay. So, I think we are
8 better situated doing work on Magnuson. We are better
9 situated at having a separate run at NOAA for example.

10 And we are better when we get the CZMA and
11 some of these other issues. We are better identifying
12 specific items that need to be fixed and giving the
13 people the opportunity to fix them.

14 Because I believe - what I hope we can see in
15 this Congress, if not this session of Congress, four,
16 five, six legislative components that will implement
17 Ocean Commission recommendations. Then everybody can
18 pat themselves on the back and say, great, let's do
19 four, five or six more next year.

20 You know, wow. We can do it that way.

21 Now, Congress doesn't quite work that way
22 because they like to bundle things so that what

1 everybody wants, you know, also then they tag on stuff
2 that nobody wants. Right? That is the way Congress
3 works.

4 And so there will be a bit of a push me, pull
5 you there. But the more we insist collectively, okay,
6 here is a problem, fix it. You know, that - I see
7 that as the path to quickest progress.

8 I have gotten some blow back on that. You
9 know, well, you opposed the comprehensive ocean
10 legislation that Senator X has introduced. I said,
11 well, you are asking me the wrong question. Do I
12 fully enjoy and support many of the components? Yes.

13 But what I am suggesting is, if you want to
14 get them moving or you want to wait for the ultimate
15 deal.

16 And then the other thing is it gives people,
17 people that rest. You know, we had comprehensive
18 energy legislation in 1992. It is now thirteen years
19 later and we are still talking about the next round of
20 comprehensive energy legislation.

21 Right? We haven't amended the Clear Air Act
22 in fifteen years. And it is because everybody wants

1 to do it all at once.

2 And so I really think we should be saying,
3 okay, the thirty year approach to legislation is
4 better addressed through the year-by-year approach to
5 legislation. So, I hope you join me in that.

6 And, by the way, that is Chairman Pombeau's
7 view in the House. And, you know, if that is the way
8 he wants to get legislation moving, great. But let's
9 get legislation moving that way.

10 So, that is - now, you asked on - I see
11 inevitability to this issue of marine management and
12 marine protected areas. So, I see inevitability to
13 it.

14 So, to me it is just merely the question of
15 how we set a constructive as possible path with as
16 much buy in as we can enjoy. I think that is really
17 what our task is.

18 Just as, you know, when Teddy Roosevelt set
19 up the park system way back when. It started with one
20 or two. Right? And it is a hundred year later. A
21 hundred years later we have this jewel, you know,
22 these emeralds sprinkled all over with the build-out,

1 with acceptance all the time. I see this as the same
2 thing.

3 It would be a mistake, by the way, you know,
4 to sort of do a lay on and say we are going to do it
5 all at once now. Because what that really means is
6 maybe twenty years from now we will do some of it
7 then. And so, you know, we really should be just
8 laying it out.

9 And finding those communities that want it.
10 And lets spend our time there. I could spend a lot of
11 my time working with folks who don't want something.
12 I would rather spend my time with the people who want
13 something. Take progress that way.

14 So, thank you all. Great to see you. Thank
15 you for your work. I really look forward to the fruit
16 of your effort later - in a couple of months, I guess.

17 Good luck with it.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: If you don't want your section
20 excluded from the report, I think expulsion is the
21 word, if you don't want your section expelled --
22 expelled from the report, come sit at the table. I

1 guess there is not such thing - word as expelled.

2 Will, you are famous, this guy knew you had
3 been counting. Were you the CIA had sent him an e-
4 mail saying Radonski knows exactly how many words.

5 MR. RADONSKI: They thanked us.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: All they - here they think it
7 is the Greeks speaking. All right. We are not quite
8 whole, but we are close. Everybody who matters is
9 here, right?

10 I have an idea. That would be that we take
11 five minutes to think about and reflect upon what you
12 have just heard and see if you can draw any quick
13 lessons from what you just heard.

14 And if you can, I would like to hear it from
15 you. And I would like to have you then volunteer to
16 provide some language that we might work into our
17 report. Okay?

18 Was there anything there that was important
19 that you heard? And that is compelling for us?
20 Tundi?

21 MR. RADONSKI: No.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Never mind. I was just going

1 to say, if you didn't like what you heard, that is
2 fine. But in a sense, can we use it to get traction?

3 Tundi's hand went up, I thought, whoops. I am very
4 sorry to have presumed what you were going to - all
5 right.

6 DR. AGARDY: No, I thought it was interesting
7 that he highlighted MPAs in the context of broader
8 marine management. And I think we really have to
9 emphasize how MPAs compliment other marine management
10 measures and vice versa.

11 And I also would like to emphasize the role
12 of MPAs or the benefit that MPAs provide in really
13 providing small scale models of ocean zoning. So that
14 we can learn how to develop these kind of integrated
15 zoning plans for the ocean as possible.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay . You are not urging us to
17 introduce the word zoning into our report, though?

18 DR. AGARDY: No, I am not.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. But by implication. I
20 mean we all know that is what we are talking about.
21 Yeah. Okay. Great. George?

22 MR. LAPOINTE: Thank you, Dan. One of the

1 things I observed was that when we use MMA and MPA,
2 you know, we talk about the importance of definitions.

3 And my sense is, is he was talking about more
4 sanctuary-ish, a very limited use sites for MPAs as
5 opposed to other types of MMAs. It shows the
6 importance of that distinction for our report.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. We still, I believe,
8 have a long way to go in being clear about what we are
9 talking about. I really believe that. This is not
10 the place to fix it. But, yeah.

11 Other things you heard? Yes, Lelei and Max?

12 MR. PEAU: Mr. Chairman, one other thing that
13 I think we also ought mention was the motion on the
14 exit versus description. And he cited three examples.

15 One of those was on coral reefs. And he also
16 referenced the local exit strategies that really - a
17 cooperative effort with close consultation with local
18 jurisdiction.

19 And I think something that this community
20 should really - I was going to recommend and suggest
21 to you, Mr. Chairman, was to ensure that or direct the
22 center to develop dialogue, if it hasn't done yet,

1 with the US task force. I think there is some really
2 good opportunity for us to make a linkage.

3 We heard mentioned the task force. And I
4 think it is something that to stick to. And I think
5 it is an opportunity for us to reach out and make -
6 take the opportunity of the existence of the task
7 force to integrate our work with their work as well.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Thank you very much.
9 Max?

10 MR. PETERSON: I was not struck by the fact
11 that he emphasized regional and local cooperation. My
12 - I have met him two or three times over the years and
13 the times that we had the most success is when we
14 brought like twenty-five people who were in agreement
15 on something and said we think that you ought to do
16 this. And we gave them eleven recommendations.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you speak into the
18 microphone a bit, Max?

19 MR. PETERSON: We gave them eleven
20 recommendations, which they adopted. But the point of
21 all of this is that he also emphasized he has given
22 the lead to looking at some regional level cooperation

1 to three governors.

2 So, what this says to me is that, if we look
3 at this, we have got to look at - and I talked to him
4 briefly and said, you know, we have been talking about
5 kind of a confederation of areas. You know? Not
6 federalizing the system. And he said that was where
7 he was coming.

8 So, I think, from what I under - what I heard
9 from him, I think what we are doing is probably on the
10 right track, except for some of this clearing up of
11 some ambiguity of how we are using things.

12 And, finally, I was struck by the fact that
13 he is saying don't develop vast legislative proposals
14 or something. In fact, even look at the current
15 Magnuson-Stevens Act and some others to, if there is
16 no authority and Carol and I talked a little bit about
17 that again. If there is a lack of authority to create
18 MPAs, that is something that could be tucked in the
19 Magnuson-Stevens Act potentially.

20 So, we need to look at some things. He is an
21 action oriented guy, as you indicated. So, we need to
22 think about some things that we can put in our report

1 that can be taken on right away.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Yeah.

3 MR. PETERSON: Thank you.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Gil?

5 MR. RADONSKI: Well, I heard two things. One
6 that, in response to my counting question, he views
7 MPAs as a management philosophy, rather than an
8 entity. He doesn't see them as MPAs, he sees it as a
9 management process.

10 And from that I gathered you can use the
11 philosophy of MPA, MMA interchangeably. That is what
12 I gathered from it.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I heard - I thought I
14 heard him say, sorry to disagree, I thought I heard
15 him say that MMAs are - that MPAs are a subset of
16 MMAs, which are part of a management portfolio. That
17 is what I heard.

18 MR. RADONSKI: Well, when I clarified it with
19 Cameron, she seemed to think that I got it right.
20 But, okay.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well -

22 MR. RADONSKI: But it is looking at it as a

1 management process, either way.

2 The second thing that I heard him say was
3 that - I hope it will follow through, that the skids
4 are being greased for the Secretaries to receive our
5 report. That they are going to be made aware of this.

6 That this is going to be one of the items discussed
7 as the cabinet level.

8 So, I think the Secretaries will be put on
9 notice that this report will be coming. And it will
10 probably carry a little more weight than it would have
11 otherwise. So, I was glad to hear that.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I asked him again - I
13 credit Bob Bendick for this insight this morning, I
14 asked him before he spoke if he would be willing to
15 sit down with a few people from this group in April,
16 before we have our final report approved, to - so that
17 he could get - I think the term of art in this town,
18 is a heads up on what we were thinking about. And
19 then talk to Cameron about it.

20 And, you know, they said, oh yeah, we will
21 get all the heads of agencies in there. And I said,
22 no, no, no, no, not that. Just a few of you.

1 And so we will pursue that. And in another
2 way, that is a way to sort of grease the skids and
3 bring him along, his office along.

4 So, that is underway, if we have your
5 authority - approval to do that.

6 MR. RADONSKI: But, you know, I think now with
7 the idea of going again with an open-ended piece of
8 paper, I mean this - when you go in there, it is going
9 to be with - pretty much with the piece of paper that
10 we are getting ready to -

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: It will - you know, they are
12 going to want to see something. And so Lauren will
13 talk about some dates. But let's call it the April
14 8th draft is what they will have or something like
15 that.

16 It will be something. I was very clear with
17 them, it will not have been an approved document when
18 they see it. But it will be a work really close to
19 coming out of the oven.

20 Tundi?

21 DR. AGARDY: I just wanted to add that I
22 really liked his language when he was talking about

1 the Blue Water to White Water initiative. And I think
2 we should adopt some of that language.

3 He said that partnerships grew out of a
4 common agenda or the recognition of a common agenda.
5 And I think in describing our regional approach to
6 this, that we could use some of that language and that
7 sentiment.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Would there be - I mean
9 later on this afternoon we have to talk about next
10 steps and the future and so on. And we have heard
11 about these regional initiatives. And I guess I would
12 like to ask you to think about whether it might be a
13 good idea for our first meeting after we have been
14 reconstituted, to ask this chap and other people if -
15 could we come to the Gulf region and maybe have a
16 certain governor from Florida be involved with this or
17 something.

18 I mean is there political benefit in being
19 that blatant about trying to find a region that is
20 struggling with this stuff. And should it be that
21 region? And are those the right players? Okay. Do
22 we want to do that?

1 John?

2 DR. OGDEN: Yeah. I will just say there will
3 be a - pursuant to that Gulf of Mexico initiative
4 brought on by Jeb Bush, there will be a meeting in
5 Texas - I believe it is going to be at Texas A&M,
6 Corpus Christie in November of 2005. Which might fit
7 well into the - into the reconstituted committee and
8 exactly that strategy. I think that is a good
9 strategy.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Lauren is going to ask you
11 about two possible windows for meetings in November.
12 So, you know, we are sort of in the same month here.
13 I don't know how November works for you.

14 But the issue is, we have been in business
15 for two years. I think despite moments of great
16 fright that this thing is coming unraveled, I do think
17 we have a wonderful document, no matter what it looks
18 like at this moment. I am very confident it is going
19 to be put back together and it will be very good.

20 And we should be proud of what we have done.
21 And I think it is time that we can start - I won't
22 say take it on the road, but it is time that we could

1 open up to some other people now and become a little
2 more political. If you don't feel uncomfortable doing
3 so.

4 Yes, Bob?

5 MR. BENDICK: I am sort of building on that.
6 I thought you were going to say something a little
7 different. But having a visit with the governor or
8 their staffs and somebody on the west coast and the
9 east coast and maybe with a couple of tribes, although
10 we have more tribal representation here than we have -
11 I think George is sort of our political state
12 representative, but at the same draft stage, visit
13 with a couple of people and - just to make sure
14 nothing is way off base, is I think consistent with
15 what we should be doing. Be sensitive to the people
16 we are talking about partnerships. And we ought to
17 just run this by some of the potential partners.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. That is correct. Very
19 good, Bob. But my thought was, if we could pull off a
20 Gulf thing with this governor from Florida and so on,
21 that we could be very much in the listing mode,
22 learning mode.

1 I mean we are not there to show them what we
2 have done. I think it ought to be in the mode of,
3 okay, we have worked for two years, we have something.
4 There is a regional operation getting going here.
5 Could we listen and watch and learn from it in
6 conjunction with what we are continuing to do? That
7 was my thought.

8 I had another hand and now I have forgotten
9 who it was. Oh, Terry?

10 MR. O'HALLORAN: He used three terms that kind
11 of struck me. Two of which I think we have already
12 done a real good job on and one I think we can
13 probably work a little bit more with.

14 And those three words were culture, local - I
15 am using more than three words, but culturally,
16 locally and economically reverent. I mean he didn't
17 use them in those sequences. But I think in the terms
18 of the cultural and local, I think we are working very
19 hard to make sure that what we are doing relates to
20 the local people and that we get by in.

21 On the economic side, I think probably we
22 could do more there. In terms of strengthening our

1 argument that this national system can have some
2 economic benefit to the local.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: We will have to - that is
4 right. We will have to pay attention to that sooner or
5 later. That is right.

6 Do you want to continue this discussion or
7 should we go back and let Mike run - he is moving
8 quickly, go back to the charts? Yes, Brian?

9 DR. MELZIAN: Just want to follow-up with some
10 -

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Closer please.

12 Look, let me say something. I have told them
13 that we find the sound system and mic set up most
14 inadequate. And she said well let me try to fix it.
15 I said no, don't bother.

16 But I have some assurance from her that when
17 we get together next time, we will have a better sound
18 system. Somehow.

19 This is - you know, having to share
20 microphones and grab them, I find it really
21 uncomfortable for everyone. And so we are going to
22 work on that.

1 Maybe each of you will have your mic. I
2 think we did that in San Mateo. You know, mics that
3 can be turned off and on. Then we say, instead of
4 getting closer to the mic, turn on your mic, George.

5 But, you know, there is a better way to
6 communicate than what we have got here. And we are
7 trying to figure it out. But I want you to know that
8 I am sorry for this.

9 I just - go ahead.

10 DR. MELZIAN: Just a follow-up on some
11 comments regarding the US Ocean Action Plan. If you
12 look at the document, you will see a listing of action
13 highlights. And some of you I have spoken to that,
14 having worked with the US Commission Ocean policy,
15 NCEQ on this action plan, those were not token
16 comments about looking for actions and activities.

17 So, they could be short term, during the next
18 year or so, with what the committee would like to do
19 or what you want the federal government to do during
20 the next year or so. Strong activities. And also
21 further down the line, for example, FY05 and 06 there
22 could be certain activities. Then later on, where you

1 need new funding, FY07.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

3 DR. MELZIAN: So, that is what they are
4 looking for. And I have worked with ADM Launtenbacher
5 and Integrated Ocean Services and Development plan.
6 That is exactly what they are looking for is discreet
7 activities and next steps. Thank you.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Wonderful. Okay. Any final
9 thoughts? Should we go back to the charts on the
10 wall? I guess we are here.

11 DR. MELZIAN: That follows up about this
12 legislation.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: So, Brian is reminding us of a
14 lot of things that could easily be put in. Show some
15 activity with other stuff.

16 DR. MELZIAN: Not only other stuff, but stuff
17 that is happening right now.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Provide examples of
19 contributions, funds in kind, infrastructure. By that
20 do you mean, Brian, things that have helped the
21 process along, that are sort of not money but?

22 DR. MELZIAN: Exactly. Not just money, in-

1 kind contributions.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. If you have examples,
3 you can feed them to us. We will find a place to put
4 them in.

5 Defining action in management plans. Yes, of
6 course. Provide examples of the sources of financial,
7 technical and logistical support.

8 What you are asking for, Brian, if you were -
9 specific tidbits that connect with other things.

10 DR. MELZIAN: Just examples.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Whose is this? I
12 thought you were green now.

13 DR. GARZA: I changed three times.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Chameleon there. Okay.

15 DR. GARZA: Green, blue and red.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Under existing
17 provisions including through co-management provided
18 through treaty or law, citizens tribes. Okay.

19 So, as we do this, we will make sure we get
20 this language in, Dolly. And if we are not sure about
21 it, we will be in touch. Okay? Good

22 Okay, here is change governance to

1 management. I think we have talked about that.

2 Nobody has trouble with us swapping out governance and
3 putting in management? Is that all right?

4 Who is this blue? Is that still you? Then
5 change - custom - ecological knowledge.

6 Okay. Convert norms of nouns. Convert nouns
7 to verbs. Say identify the scribe, propose an action.

8 So, we will get our global search and replace.

9 Who is Carol?

10 MS. DINKINS: That was just an editorial
11 comment. And I was saying you don't need to read it
12 off.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Okay. Brian again. Add
14 economics to evaluation and monitoring. Who, what
15 would develop explicit criteria for decommissioning.
16 You mean expulsion, don't you?

17 MR. MELZIAN: Like Eric -

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right. I mean
19 failures, I suppose. You know, whatever we -
20 delisting or something? No?

21 MR. PETERSON: I would use the word changes
22 there.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Change status?

2 MR. PETERSON: I would use the word changes
3 because it might be enlargement. It might be moving
4 them. It might be all kinds of things. So -

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever.

6 MR. PETERSON: Yeah. So, if you use the word
7 change - changes, then that could include
8 disestablishment or enlargement or moving it or
9 whatever.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That is great. Thanks.
11 Perhaps I had definition for top down and bottom up.
12 Do you need clarity on that?

13 DR. MELZIAN: The reason I mentioned that is
14 that when the US Commission Ocean Policy wrote its
15 report, they wrote it just as much for the general
16 public as it did for Congress and the President. And
17 I absolutely guaranty the general public doesn't have
18 a clue on some of these types of terms. So, it is not
19 a hard sell.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

21 DR. MELZIAN: We know what it is, but most
22 people don't.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Add participatory research to
2 the glossary. Okay. Add economics under formal
3 research. Now, is this you again, Dolly? Okay.

4 Informal organizations and tribes. These are
5 language things that we know how it fits now, I
6 believe. The issue of cultural compliance. Yeah,
7 cultural compliance. That was a big deal to us at one
8 time.

9 What is this, Dolly?

10 DR. GARZA: Okay. So for me, because culture
11 was used before there, then we have culture of
12 compliance again. The culture was the issue. So, the
13 suggestions I have there was I think environmental
14 ethic is part of that?

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Compliance or conservation
16 ethics. I think the point here with culture of
17 compliance was not so much a conservation ethic, but
18 it was a sense of commitment to the program. And it
19 was kind of an incentive to comply and to avoid
20 external enforcement mechanisms.

21 So, Bonnie, I hate to kick you out. But I
22 think early on culture of compliance came out. Didn't

1 it Lelei?

2 DR. McCAY: Yeah, we have that.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Do any norms of compliance?

4 No? MR. O'HALLORAN: I think what we are
5 talking about is creating a real sense of stewardship
6 of people that are actually out there on the ocean
7 using it. It is the example he gave of the captain
8 with the bullhorn like you are getting outside of the
9 line where we have got a culture of compliance based
10 on their wanting to comply.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we can work on this. I
12 agree with that.

13 And customary knowledge. We have got to
14 solve issues and conflicts, changing - cultural
15 values. Dolly, a lot of these are some excellent
16 points. Could you give us? Can you just trust us to
17 do this or would you like to hear the particular
18 sentences?

19 DR. GARZA: They are all just small.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Who is this green now?

21 DR. SUMAN: That was me.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, like five, forty-four.

1 Maybe the problems are more of a genic kind of change.

2 So, you would like recognition of some of these
3 changes going on in the marine habitat, but not all?

4 DR. SUMAN: No, some are national.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Dolly, this looks like
6 you again. Take care of that. Who is this?

7 DR. HALSEY: That is mine.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Halsey?

9 DR. HALSEY: Yeah.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Natural resources and cultural
11 resources.

12 DR. HALSEY: That was in the line. There is a
13 tendency in such situations for local users to believe
14 that the natural resources and cultural and unique
15 non-removable cultural resources, quote, belong to the
16 local people.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Implications? I doubt we are
18 going to scratch that section. So, we can come back.

19 But maybe we should. A list of acronyms?

20 Add the word territories, territorial as
21 appropriate. All right.

22 Graphics is okay. Here is a question I would

1 like to ask you. Who is green? We should cite the
2 key documents from so and so and so and so. Yeah.

3 To me, maybe for this audience, the fewer the
4 references the better. I assume that is what you
5 mean, Dan. Don't want to get excessive.

6 Can you tell me exactly where we might stop
7 if we start down this road of citing all these other
8 bodies and publications and what have you? Is it
9 clear to everybody where we would want to stop?

10 DR. SUMAN: After Department of Interior.
11 After it has a heart service, perhaps.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: After meeting?

13 DR. SUMAN: After NRC, NOAA and National Park
14 Service.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, well, I didn't mean leave
16 these off the list. I guess I meant those of us who
17 have to draft this are going to have to make a
18 decision about what to include. And those of you that
19 work on a subcommittee, you might recall should call
20 up and remind you that a lot of you add citations to
21 such and such and add citation to such and such. They
22 are all missing the call. You notice that? Are you

1 mad at me for it?

2 So, now some of you might want to put it down
3 here. The question is exactly how much -

4 DR. MELZIAN: Mr. Chairman, this is Brian
5 again. There are certainly some documents that you
6 definitely want to cite. And I have listed one.
7 There is very scientific and political reasons the US
8 Commission on Ocean Policy report and US Ocean Action
9 Plan, for example. I am sure there is some seminal
10 scientific papers about marine managed and marine
11 protected areas that could be programmatic or
12 scientific reviews that could be used, simply as e.g.,
13 for some of the sentences. That is what it is.

14 Because there are people out there, from my
15 experience in the government, that will look into
16 this. They want to know where some of these
17 statements come from.

18 So, anything that we could add without being
19 too burdensome I think will enhance.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you ever thought about the
21 politics of citations?

22 DR. MELZIAN: Yes.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: The politics of citations
2 within the academic community, not government reports.
3 The politics big time. You are known by the company
4 you keep. You are judged.

5 So, you know, maybe - I will tell you what.
6 Why don't we ask Joe and Lauren and those experts to
7 provide a list of the documents and government reports
8 and connections they believe are most important for
9 us? And give as much academic stuff. Bonnie, did you
10 have something?

11 DR. McCAY: Well, it is a deja vu experience
12 here. We talked about this very early on. What are
13 the key documents. And it seemed as if, A, there were
14 too many of them to reasonably identify. And,
15 secondly, there was considerable disagreement.
16 Because it is political. So, we could refer to the
17 center's website in the bibliography.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Something. Okay, I mean there
19 is tribal politics within the academy. And it really
20 shows up with brute force in this stuff.

21 MR. LAPOINTE: Before we move on -

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

1 MR. LAPOINTE: I am kind of the guy who
2 believes in the politics of the lack of biography.
3 Look at the Ocean Action Plan we have been talking
4 about and look for the number of citations in here.
5 Almost none. So, don't go too crazy with it.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, that is right. And if
7 you look at this one carefully, I have only let four
8 in, I think. And - but I grant you that all of these
9 important acronym - acronymical stuff is out. And it
10 probably needs to be back in. But I think we are
11 better off not to have it in.

12 Going on. Okay, glossary. So - we can take
13 care of this. Who is the red? Nice handwriting in
14 red. Who is that? This is Mel right here. Yeah,
15 right. Mel talked to me. Add a tribal government
16 section. Perhaps in the nomination process. Do you
17 want to say a word about it?

18 MR. MOON: Sure. I know we have a lot of
19 language throughout the document that refers to tribes
20 and states. But - and we have also had some further
21 discussion about the inclusion of traditional
22 activities and ceremonial subsistence.

1 But what really seems to be lacking is what
2 do you do when you encounter a tribe or a tribe
3 encounters an interest group. It doesn't seem that
4 there is a lot of definition there.

5 And most times you have a requirement for
6 consultation, yet both sides don't know what that is
7 either. So, I thought that it would be helpful if we
8 had under the nomination process, that would be like
9 first contact, a described process for the
10 interaction, MOUs, whatever.

11 The other problem I have is that, if we don't
12 define this, people assume there is one - there is a
13 process out there that exists. And ninety-nine
14 percent of the time there is a process that exists,
15 but it is a state process.

16 And so tribal people aren't going to go to a
17 state process, they are going to look to their own
18 tribal governments and say how are we going to deal
19 with this. And then the governments are going to call
20 its own hearings and have its own data collection.

21 So, I thought it would be best to actually
22 have a section that had a reference to what do you do.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree. And can you work with
2 us on that?

3 MR. MOON: I will work with you on that.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Wonderful. All
5 right. It turns out that our master wordsmith has to
6 leave at three o'clock. And we have a few more
7 things, but I think we can take care of them.

8 I think we had better get back to the why
9 part. And - so -

10 DR. FUJITA: I think you are now receiving a
11 copy of the latest attempt to mollify all of you. I
12 have my velcro vest on and am ready to take comments.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Get the microphone closer to
14 you, Rod.

15 DR. OGDEN: Mr. Chairman? I thought it might
16 be, in pursuant to the discussion we had after
17 Connaughton's talk just to point out - and if I read
18 this budget correctly, the National Marine Sanctuary
19 program base has been cut approximately \$20 million
20 from fifty-three to thirty-five roughly in this
21 budget. So, for what it is worth.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have got to get going

1 to Rod here. Rod, go ahead.

2 DR. FUJITA: Does everybody have a copy? Not
3 quite. Okay. Well, we start this statement of need
4 again with a statement of public concern has never
5 been greater. We have removed references to
6 scientific studies on the advice of Dave Benton
7 because we thought there might be turf warfare
8 erupting over which citations were the correct ones.

9 We have included reference to the Great Lakes
10 in the first sentence. And thereafter a reference - a
11 glossary, which we hope will include a definition of
12 marine to mean the ocean and Great Lakes. Apparently
13 that is standard practice in a lot of federal
14 documents.

15 We have made an attempt throughout this
16 document to elevate cultural resources to parity with
17 natural resources. So, you will see additional
18 language about cultural and natural heritage
19 throughout the document.

20 We have restructured it slightly to move the
21 executive order and our charge to the statement of
22 need because Max pointed out that the executive order

1 doesn't really respond to - it doesn't address the
2 problems, but it was issued in response to concern.
3 And I think that is right.

4 So, we tried to develop the rationale in the
5 statement of need section for doing something else.
6 By pointing out the lack of coordination and the cost
7 associated with the lack of coordination.

8 Then we moved to the benefits of the MPA
9 system. We moved the section that explains that MPAs
10 can be an important tool, as you heard James
11 Connaughton say. They are acknowledged as important
12 tools.

13 And we are at pains here to explain that
14 other tools are used successfully. But MPAs can add
15 value. Try to convey the idea that MPAs are not going
16 to solve these problems all by themselves, but have to
17 be used concert with other approaches.

18 We then cite some of the benefits that are
19 well known from MPAs. Many of these are mentioned
20 yesterday.

21 And then we end by saying that we think that
22 this national system will add value to the individual

1 sites by bringing them together.

2 We then articulate the benefits of this
3 national system of MPAs, emphasizing the synergistic.

4 And we then attempt to create a vision statement in
5 the last paragraph of that section, in the second
6 sentence.

7 We envision the national system of MPAs,
8 based on regional goals and priorities brought
9 together under a national umbrella that adds value by
10 filling gaps, ensuring that MPAs help sustain each
11 other, bring coherence to the existing array of MPAs
12 and enhances the stewardship of our natural and
13 cultural marine resources.

14 Then we have our little disclaimer statement
15 about how it is not going to hurt anybody. And the
16 call to action is essentially the same.

17 So, Mr. Chairman, maybe we should let people
18 absorb this?

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Yeah, lets do that. We
20 will take a couple of minutes. Notice the word
21 envision. Rod, this is beautiful. Right under the
22 executive order. Not to judge - not to influence how

1 you read it, but notice under the executive order,
2 this committee envisions. Not bad.

3 DR. FUJITA: Okay.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe some people don't like
5 it. I think it is very good. Okay. There is a word
6 missing. Rod now knows that the very last sentence,
7 right after the word regional - regional entities to
8 share the vision of the national MPA system. So, Rod,
9 pick that up.

10 Okay. Let me ask a macro level question.
11 Are you happier with this? Are you happier with this?

12 DR. FUJITA: I certainly am, Mr. Chairman.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, you are. Anybody not
14 happy with it in the large? In the large, i.e., the
15 wrong emphasis, the wrong order, not wording, in the
16 large? Anybody unhappy with it in the large?

17 MR. O'HALLORAN: Dolly made a comment that she
18 said can - the question might be framed as can you
19 live with it.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Wonderful. Can you live with
21 it? Are you embarrassed by it? Can you live with it?
22 That is nice, Dolly. Can people live with it? With

1 the few little wrinkles here and there? This is good
2 progress.

3 DR. FUJITA: I don't see Dave Benton around.
4 His affirmative response would be greatly appreciated.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: We will just tell him he missed
7 his kicking the can. No, no. Okay. We can live with
8 it. I declare it livable. Okay?

9 And that means minimally acceptable. Yes,
10 Terry?

11 MR. O'HALLORAN: Well, now that this is
12 livable - I am very happy with it. And I just think -
13 I just want to commend Rod -

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: And his colleagues.

15 MR. O'HALLORAN: Well, and his comments. But
16 the job he did was very, very good. I mean he really
17 helped synthesize and work with everybody. At one
18 time I think we had just about everybody from the
19 committee sitting in on this little task. And so this
20 really is a combination of input from most everybody
21 around here. So, thank you, Rod.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: No, Rod is wonderfully skilled.

1 (Applause.)

2 DR. FUJITA: I try to live by the principals
3 that we have set forth in this document. There was a
4 bottom up, participatory process.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: And you are at the bottom.

6 DR. McCAY: As you have often reminded us, you
7 mean top down, as well.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have something, not
9 only that is minimally livable, but it is, in many
10 people's eyes, very nice. It will reappear in the
11 proper order.

12 We cut short the little flip charts, at least
13 according to one or two people. Maybe I should run
14 back up there and we can finish that off. And what
15 time is it, Lauren? We are at quarter until three.
16 Give them a break? They had a break from quarter to
17 two until two. What is this? Dolly?

18 DR. GARZA: There are only two more things on
19 the chart. I would be glad to read them for you since
20 it is behind me.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, please. Lets do that.

22 DR. GARZA: Okay. One is to monitor invasive

1 species. I am not sure who added that.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: John Halsey. So, we want to
3 add some language about invasive species?

4 DR. GARZA: Okay. And then the last one is
5 also mine. And I changed to red, just to let you
6 know. And it was on the definition that we seem to be
7 struggling with on traditional ecological knowledge.
8 So, I have got it down.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

10 DR. GARZA: To traditional ecological
11 knowledge encompasses the generational and cultural
12 knowledge held by the local tribes or other indigenous
13 groups.

14 MR. PETERSON: There are people that have -

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Speak up, Max, please.

16 MR. PETERSON: There are people have customary
17 and traditional knowledge that are not necessarily -
18 suppose they have been at it 300 years.

19 DR. GARZA: That will be a different
20 definition that Bonnie is working on.

21 MR. PETERSON: Yeah? Okay.

22 DR. GARZA: And so my concern was by trying to

1 make it combined, it became two. And so we leave it
2 at that. Because TEK is in any native document. That
3 when you are working with tribes, it is there. So,
4 for us to change it I think would be incorrect.

5 MR. PETERSON: Okay. As long as we don't lose
6 the fact that there is other conditional knowledge out
7 there.

8 DR. GARZA: Right.

9 DR. McCAY: Excuse me. May I just enter this.
10 Yes, and I think what we have done already and we
11 would do more consistently is have the pair
12 traditional ecological knowledge and experience based
13 knowledge. Use that - those two together.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Lauren has made me give in and
15 we are going to have a break until three o'clock.

16 (Applause.)

17 (A brief recess was taken.)

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we try to come back
19 together for the last trip around the track? I will
20 wait just a minute. Maybe there is a few more people
21 coming in.

22 DR. MELZIAN: I will go get them.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you? Go outside and act
2 like a jerk. Oh, I didn't mean it that way. Happy to
3 have somebody else do that job.

4 We have - we are at three o'clock. We have
5 on our agenda in a sense a break at 3:15. I promise
6 you we are not going to do that. At 3:30 it says we
7 are going to have a summary of the document review
8 status and next steps. At 4:30 we are going to do
9 committee business. And we are going to adjourn at
10 5:00.

11 So, we are at 3:00. And in a sense, the 1:30
12 agenda item was reflections and next steps. I am open
13 to having a brief conversation about next steps.

14 Lauren and I have done a bit of work on
15 timing and schedule and so on. We can talk about
16 that. Maybe we need to go back over what is going to
17 happen, what is expected of us, how we are going to
18 get back. Are you ready for that? Okay, Lauren, why
19 do you, if you don't mind, lets just walk through the
20 timing that Lauren and I think we face.

21 MS. WENZEL: Okay. So this is what we talked
22 about. I think we - Dan had floated the idea that we

1 would have the executive committee work with - on
2 getting this draft in order and that we would give
3 ourselves about a month to get out the revised draft.

4 And this is being mindful of the need to get it out
5 quickly, but thinking that this draft, the next time
6 you see it, should include all the changes that we
7 discussed today. And also include a draft executive
8 summary and recommendations.

9 And so the group would sort of take it upon
10 themselves to extract those from the document and get
11 those out.

12 Then the whole committee would have about
13 three weeks to look at it. We would ask for comments
14 by April 8th. And then the executive committee would
15 have another three weeks to take all those comments
16 and incorporate them and get a review draft out by
17 April 29th.

18 And that is the draft that we would take to
19 the meeting. So, that would be out three weeks in
20 advance of the May meeting.

21 DR. OGDEN: What are the dates of the May
22 meeting again?

1 MS. WENZEL: May 17th through 19th.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: So, we have March 17th, 18th,
3 something like that. We have April 8th and April
4 29th, with only one iteration. Mary?

5 MS. GLACKIN: One of the suggestions I heard
6 earlier today that I thought was a good one, that I
7 think would happen between the 29th of April and the
8 17th of May is the kind of heads up if people had some
9 significant issues. So, you might want to consider
10 getting any kind of big heads up issues back a week
11 before the May meeting actually starts. I don't know,
12 it is kind of how you want to manage.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I ask for clarification.
14 Do you mean the sort of statement such as I cannot,
15 under any circumstances, agree with section two? Is
16 that what you mean?

17 MS. GLACKIN: Yeah. I think that. Or maybe I
18 still think we have a problem over here kind of thing.
19 It was a suggestion I heard this morning that I
20 thought resonated in the room. Maybe I am wrong.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That is right. And that
22 is wonderful, Mary. I think part of the issue in

1 terms of how to think about that is how you see the
2 May meeting. Not you, Mary, but you - you know, all
3 of us. How do we see the May meeting?

4 By that I mean what do you expect that we
5 will do there? George is going to line up some stuff.

6
7 But between eight and five, what is it that
8 people imagine we are going to do there? And that is
9 kind of an agenda item. What do you want to do in
10 May? So, maybe this is the time to sort of think
11 about that.

12 And let me remind you, at this meeting, we
13 had I guess, Lauren, we probably had a day and a half
14 or a day and two-thirds to work on this document.
15 Lets see. Which meant a day and a third for other
16 stuff.

17 Do you envision in May another day and two-
18 thirds working on this document? And, one, if I don't
19 have my arithmetic wrong, you know, for presentations.

20 Yes, Gil?

21 MR. RADONSKI: I think the committee talked
22 about this before. And, you know, we are going to have

1 a life after May. And we have to ask the question
2 what are we going to do when we grow up. So, I -

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right.

4 MR. RADONSKI: So, we have to look at that
5 next and start planning and putting some things on the
6 table and then putting a priority to those issues.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: And I would appreciate some
8 help here from John and Mary and others. But it is my
9 understanding that when we are reconstituted, if we
10 are, or reappointed, if we are, whatever the right
11 term is, will we have - Mary, will we have some
12 specific tasks given to us? Joe? Mary? Let Joe
13 answer.

14 MR. URAVITCH: Yes. Yes, there will be
15 meetings between the two departments prior to the
16 reappointment and the appointment of any new members.

17 And there will be a whole new set of charges that
18 will come out.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

20 MR. URAVITCH: The question is one of timing.
21 Obviously, I think it would make sense to get them
22 out as soon as possible. If you don't meet until

1 November.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. So, let me ask you this.

3 We, from our own document, I think we would be able
4 to identify things that we think we ought to do next.

5 But there is a chance that that may not be the same
6 list that we are handed.

7 MR. URAVITCH: That is correct.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Dolly?

9 DR. GARZA: Just a clarification. Could you
10 state the three dates that we need again between now
11 and May of when things need to be reviewed? I was
12 trying to find my calendar.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: The three dates? Yeah. Go
14 ahead.

15 MS. WENZEL: Okay. So the three dates are
16 March 17th, the executive committee will send the
17 draft out to the full committee. April 8th, all the
18 comments from the full committee would be due.

19 DR. GARZA: Slow down. Slow down. April
20 what?

21 MS. WENZEL: April 8th. And April 29th the
22 executive committee would send the full draft out.

1 And then May 17th through 19th is the meeting.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: I have George and then Mark.

3 MR. LAPOINTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One
4 of the things that happened at this meeting I think
5 was - certainly I felt like I had the rabbit in the
6 headlight look at the end where we didn't get any down
7 time to rest from either talking to ourselves or being
8 talked to.

9 And for myself, the return per unit effort on
10 new discussion topics, new panels is pretty low at
11 this point. And I know we have to do some, but if we
12 could try to minimize that for the May meeting, I
13 think that would be helpful for me anyway.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. Mark?

15 DR. HIXON: My thoughts about the May meeting,
16 besides ratifying what we have created and sending it
17 on, would be to actually meet with the feds and come
18 up with a common list of action items for the
19 reconstituted committee. So that we have shared ideas
20 and reached some agreement.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that possible, Joe?

22 MR. URAVITCH: No, because we have to raise

1 these issues to the leadership of both departments.
2 So, we don't have the authority to make those
3 decisions.

4 We could certainly work with you so that we
5 understand what the committee would like to recommend
6 that the following committee take on. We can take
7 that to the leadership in both agencies as they go
8 through their discussions.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Could that - could that be
10 something we do at the May meeting?

11 MR. URAVITCH: Yes.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: So, there you go. That is
13 great. Thanks, Mark. So, we can spend time in May
14 identifying next steps, scoping out what they might
15 entail, whether they are long run things that can be
16 done in three meetings or short run things in one
17 meeting or something. Right? We can provide a list.
18 Is that right?

19 MR. URAVITCH: Yes, of what you think the next
20 committee ought to undertake. And then we can take
21 those, along with the other issues that come up within
22 both departments to the political leadership in both

1 agencies to make sure these are all part of a basket
2 of ideas that are being considered.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is great. And is it
4 correct that the reappointment or the reauthorization,
5 whatever it is called, would take place after July 1?

6 So, we are not pressed by that date? This would be
7 something that would occur after the end of our life
8 on June 30th? Lauren?

9 MS. WENZEL: I think most member's terms
10 expire something like June 24th. So, you all will get
11 letters before that date.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: But the point is we could work
13 on something in May. We might even be able to go away
14 in May and do a little more refinement and get it back
15 to you folks and that would not be too late to play a
16 role in the restructuring. Is that correct? Lauren?

17 MR. URAVITCH: Lauren is the designated
18 federal officer.

19 MS. WENZEL: Yeah, that is correct.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: As long as we got it done
21 before June 24th.

22 MS. WENZEL: Right. Well, there should be no

1 break. But it would probably be better to get it
2 done.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Yeah. Okay. George?

4 MR. LAPOINTE: My only concern about that is
5 we not get too excited about the current - the new
6 tasks so much that we don't have enough time to finish
7 our current report.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right. One thing I
9 would like to ask people to think about as we go
10 through and work on the current report is that you do
11 give some thought to what you think next steps are.

12 What are the problematic things that you -
13 you know, you are happy with what we have here or you
14 can accept it, you are not embarrassed by it, you can
15 live with it. But you really would like to see more
16 attention paid to something. It would be good, I
17 think, to start to scope that out.

18 Yes, Bob?

19 MR. ZALES: I have got a question about what
20 happens with the new constitution of the new
21 committee. Does it have to go through kind of like a
22 simple transition? Are we going to have to go - when

1 I say we, presuming that some of us would be
2 reappointed. But do we have to go through a whole new
3 transition, similar to the first meeting? Can it be
4 like a simple thing and whenever new members come on,
5 just helping them get oriented into the process?

6 MS. WENZEL: It should be pretty
7 straightforward. I mean almost everyone said that
8 they wanted to continue serving on the committee. And
9 so we have recommended that everyone who wants to
10 continue will continue serving. And then we expect to
11 have one to two new members. So, they would just get
12 up. We will get them oriented and up and running.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: We would have to have new
14 elections. John?

15 DR. HALSEY: That was my question. Would
16 there be new elections?

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. There has to be new
18 elections. Okay. What else? Terry? Oh, Dolly? I
19 am sorry.

20 DR. GARZA: Don't tell me I look like him.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: No, George was pointing in your
22 direction and your hand was not very high. So,

1 thought George was pointing at Terry. So -

2 DR. GARZA: Okay. Two points. One I think we
3 should discuss now what voting mechanism we will use.
4 We may say we will strive for unanimous support,
5 however we will accept either a majority vote, a
6 majority plus one or, B, the other thing that we use
7 in Alaska is a super majority, which requires two-
8 thirds vote. I am going to say that is what we are
9 going to use.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is good. Yeah. And in a
11 sense, I think part of that, Dolly, is how many
12 separate questions on the document we are going to
13 allow. In other words, how finely are we going to
14 allow the document to be parts up and voted on or do
15 we vote on the entirety. Isn't that an issue that we
16 have to address?

17 Let me - pardon. Go ahead, Max.

18 MR. PETERSON: Let me chime in with Dolly and
19 say I think we should strive for as near unanimity as
20 possible. That should be what we strive for. And I
21 would be disappointed if we don't get eighty or ninety
22 percent vote. But Robert's Rules of Order, only for

1 revision of bylaws and a few things like that, is
2 there a mandatory requirement. But I think we just
3 ought to make a decision by agreement that we are
4 going to strive for as near to unanimity as we can.

5 And second is I think we should try to adopt
6 the document as a whole and say that somebody - is
7 there a part of the document you simply can't live
8 with. If there is, try to deal with that. Because I
9 think that would help us reach unanimity. Okay?

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to come in May at
11 some point in the meeting and move that we adopt it by
12 acclamation or something like this, in its entirety,
13 if I am using the right words. Okay?

14 And then we can have some discussion. Dolly,
15 is this acceptable in the parliamentary sense?

16 MR. PETERSON: Except the chairman can't make
17 a motion.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: I know. Don't think I can't
19 find somebody to do it for me.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: I know.

22 MR. PETERSON: You would be embarrassed.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: But by acclamation or
2 something. I do believe we do ourselves great credit
3 if we can do that. Dolly, you wouldn't believe how
4 many guys you have pointing at you. George, Terry,
5 they are all kind of pointing at Dolly. So -

6 DR. GARZA: So, Max brought up what is
7 correct. I mean under Robert's Rules of Order, it
8 would be fifty plus one. I mean that is what we are
9 following. We didn't say two-third vote. And when we
10 reconstitute, we may consider changing that so it is a
11 minimum of two-thirds. But we can just say that we
12 are striving for unanimous.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. And by the rules of these
14 things, we may not have the capacity to impose a super
15 majority, but lets not worry about that. There was a
16 hand, Terry? I am sorry, Steve?

17 DR. MURRAY: Consistent with Max's comment
18 about attempting to find as many folks as possible
19 supportive of this and identifying any substantive
20 issues. Somewhere between April 29th and May 17th to
21 19th, you should be notified I think of anybody who
22 cannot live with a particular section or portion of

1 the document. So there would at least be some time to
2 try to adjudicate whatever those issues are.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Would this be something
4 that would be - in case you haven't noticed, I have
5 tried to resist at all cost motions and amendments and
6 all of this parliamentary falderal.

7 But let me ask if you would feel that this
8 might be a time to take a formal action on that or we
9 just leave it as an understanding. What is your wish?
10 Terry?

11 MR. O'HALLORAN: Well, I think we have
12 operated very well under the concept of understanding
13 and at least trusting each other that we are going to
14 speak up if we have a problem with something. And I
15 wouldn't see any reason now to say that we no longer
16 trust our colleagues. That they are going to withhold
17 something that they have problems with just to torpedo
18 at the end.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Therefore, we have to take
20 formal action now to preclude it. So, I think when it
21 comes out on April 29th, is it okay if Lauren or
22 however we do this, if there is a statement in there

1 that says please, if you find parts of this document
2 that you cannot live with, you let all of us know as
3 soon as possible? Is that right, Steve? Is that the
4 sense, Max? Not wait until May 17th, but let us all
5 know as soon as possible exactly why?

6 MR. PETERSON: Absolutely right.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: What it is and why.

8 MR. PETERSON: If there is something in there
9 that somebody can't live with, they owe it to the
10 group to tell us.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

12 MR. PETERSON: So that we are not -

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Get back to Lauren, I guess.

14 MS. WENZEL: By a given date?

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: By a given date. Okay, Steve
16 and then Mike Cruickshank.

17 DR. MURRAY: That is also my intent. But it
18 is also awkward in the spirit of attempting to find a
19 way to adjudicate whatever those issues are. Because
20 what we are striving for is to come up with something
21 that we all can support.

22 So, if there is an issue there, perhaps we

1 will be able to deal with it, if we know what it is
2 and time to work on it.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we want to put a sunset on
4 it that if we don't hear back within five days or
5 eight days or ten days, we will all come to wherever
6 we are going, George, with the assumption that
7 everybody can support it? I mean do we want to make
8 it that explicit? If you haven't registered this
9 opposition by a certain date? Are we getting too
10 prescriptive? George?

11 MR. LAPOINTE: I think you are getting too
12 prescriptive. The obligation to come early is a moral
13 obligation and not a bylaws obligation. And we need
14 to -

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. The view that as a
16 courtesy to all of us, if you have something in here
17 you can't live with, as a courtesy let us all know
18 soon and why. And what it would take for you to find
19 it livable.

20 MR. O'HALLORAN: I agree with you. I think if
21 anyone disagrees with something, it isn't enough just
22 to whine about it, you have to have a solution to it.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. So, is that a fair
2 sense here? That if you find something in here you
3 cannot accept, it is your obligation to let all of us
4 know very soon. And it is your obligation to propose
5 a solution to it, what it would take to make it
6 acceptable. Do people feel comfortable with this?
7 Mike?

8 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Don't want to be a torpedo.
9 I just want to mention something -

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is better than a snake in
11 the grass.

12 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Yes, it is. These are two
13 issues that were brought up but I wrote them in pen,
14 so you probably didn't see them. But one was the
15 question of 874 about the definition of sustainable
16 production. It says as MPA is established and
17 managed, principally support continues, et cetera, et
18 cetera.

19 But there is no mention of what the second
20 is. So, it leaves you hanging. Is it is principally
21 for - but no records is the other thing. There is no
22 other page. It is just before.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

2 DR. CRUICKSHANK: What is the feeling in here
3 - I mean do we want to eliminate all of the things in
4 the sustainable production definition? Or do we
5 address it in some way, even vaguely?

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: Wind currents are a sustainable
7 production issue?

8 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Winds or currents. Yeah.
9 MMA to deal with the habitat as well.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, but is there other things
11 that humans can do to - well, okay. Could I ask
12 Michael, that you give us some specific language that
13 would address your concerns there? And we will make
14 sure it gets in. Yeah, great.

15 DR. CRUICKSHANK: And the other question I had
16 on this also was we had on the list here of possible
17 issues was the approach of the MPA sent to NEPA. When
18 I was - every time we moved we had to write and
19 prepare an assessment. And I am not sure if it was an
20 important issue we were addressing. We had to put out
21 an EIS.

22 Now, there is no reference to this at all in

1 anything that we have done. Is this an issue or is it
2 not?

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Joe?

4 MR. URAVITCH: Yeah, we have already talked to
5 the NOAA NEPA compliance officers about this. And we
6 are trying to decide what the appropriate level of
7 documentation is that needs to be done. But that
8 doesn't apply to the work of this committee. That is
9 going to apply to the work of actually designing the
10 framework for the system and the creation of the
11 system itself. But that is definitely under
12 discussion. It has been for over a year now. Yeah.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else, Mike?

14 Dr. CRUICKSHANK: No, that is it.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. George? You had your
16 hand up? Okay. So, we have a schedule. I think we
17 have a sense as to activities that we will engage in
18 between now and these different dates. You will get
19 something from us by the 17th of March. Is that
20 right?

MS. WENZEL: Yes. And just to clarify, I
21 will send out this schedule in e-mail, you know, in
22 the next couple of days. And then you will get a full

1 draft in March.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Then April 8th and April 29th
3 and then we will meet on the 17th, which means the
4 16th is a travel day of May. What else? Lauren?

5 MS. WENZEL: I guess just as we are talking
6 about logistics in May, we are going to try to do
7 something outdoors and fun on the Friday, a field
8 activity. So, you can plan on that as well.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: So, the 17th is a Tuesday. So,
10 is that correct?

11 MS. WENZEL: Yes.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: The 17th, 18th, 19th and then a
13 Friday - a fun Friday? Is that the plan?

14 MS. WENZEL: Yes. It is experiential
15 education.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday
17 we will be indoors and Friday we will be out. So, we
18 should count on a four day meeting then, I mean, in a
19 sense. Is that right?

20 Is there any - is there any sentiment that -
21 well, is three days too long to stay inside? This is
22 a bad time to ask you that.

1 MR. O'HALLORAN: If you give us reasonable
2 breaks once in a while, we might be able to do it.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Give you what?

4 MR. O'HALLORAN: I have a feeling that you
5 personally, you never take a break.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, yeah, that is what I hear
7 from my wife. Yes.

8 MR. LAPOINTE: We don't want to hear
9 everything you hear from your wife.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is what she says to me all
11 the time. When are you going to slow down?

12 DR. AGARDY: Going outside of the building for
13 lunch I think would be a big help.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Go outside the building for
15 lunch?

16 DR. AGARDY: Yeah, we could have our lunch,
17 rather than deliver it in the meeting room. Go and
18 get it somewhere.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Go and get it somewhere. So,
20 that means we need to leave - and that is fine. That
21 means we need to have a two hour lunch break rather
22 than an hour, which is fine. Okay, that helps a lot.

1

2 DR. MELZIAN: Regenerate.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. What is that?

4 DR. MELZIAN: Regenerate.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Yeah. Steve?

6 DR. MURRAY: I think in all fairness, the way
7 that the task before us for this meeting, the way the
8 agenda was set up and with the desire to get through
9 this document, you know, we were all in here for long
10 periods of time. If you look at some of the other
11 meetings, we did have breakouts and were allowing the
12 day to be broken up repetitively.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

14 DR. MURRAY: So I think this was more a
15 reflection of what we were trying to get accomplished
16 this time. Not that I wouldn't like to go outside and
17 take a break every now and then. But I think we need
18 to, as a group, to sort of consider some of the
19 uncertainties with regard to how we were going to be
20 able to get through this document and yet the
21 essentiality of moving along as we did.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Yeah. That is right.

1 And I think we have done really well at it. And I
2 applaud all of you for your persistence and
3 commitment. George? Is your hand up again?

4 MR. LAPOINTE: It was, Mr. Chairman. As part
5 of our activities and following in tradition, the
6 snorkeling trip in May in Maine should really wake
7 people up.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, then I propose we have it
10 in the middle of the meeting, maybe on Wednesday.
11 Terry? Is your hand up?

12 MR. O'HALLORAN: Yes, it was. I want to
13 change the subject from the outdoor activities, which
14 I am really looking forward to. I am not sure about
15 snorkeling there.

16 MR. LAPOINTE: Whimp.

17 MR. O'HALLORAN: Right. I am. I have a
18 concern. And this regards the states and the tribes
19 regarding our recommendations and when and how we are
20 going to interact with them between now and our May
21 meeting, when and if we are.

22 Because I think it is important that we get

1 some feedback from them as to where - just how this
2 document is really coming together. So, that if we
3 have got - if they have got comments, I would rather
4 know them before, rather than after.

5

6 And I think it fits more with our inclusive -
7 the way we are building a national system should be
8 the same way we build an individual MPA, bringing
9 stakeholders in early.

10 So, I mean that is my comment. And I do have
11 a concern. I guess not a concern but a question about
12 if and how we are going to do that.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't see how we do it, so,
14 therefore, I think the if question sort of answers
15 itself. I mean I - I - and, again, it may mean that we
16 word things in such a way that we indicate awareness
17 that we haven't done some things that need doing.

18 So, I think if we see this as a living
19 document and so on, I don't know what we do short of
20 that, Terry, given where we are. I mean Bob wants to
21 get in, George wants to get in and Max wants to get
22 in. So, okay. George, Bob and Max?

1 MR. LAPOINTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2 Because of the time, I don't think we can do a
3 meaningful engagement with the states. But I would
4 think one of our recommendations for next steps would
5 be to do just that. We have - Max and I both used to
6 work for a group that represented all fifty states and
7 the Canadian provinces as well.

8 There is an Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
9 Commission, a Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission
10 and a Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission that
11 has a similar role.

12 So, I would think that one of our next steps
13 for recommendations would be to go to those groups to
14 get that - on the part of the states to get that
15 input.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Bob and then Max.

17 MR. BENDICK: Well, I do think that somebody
18 could sit down with Tony McDonald, the guy who talked
19 to us yesterday and just go over some of this stuff.
20 And he could give us - he so conversant, he works for
21 the governors. He could really help us out.

22 I don't know whether there is somebody

1 comparable for the tribes. But I think there is
2 enough time to do that. And it would be time. Part
3 of this is all about respect. And I think it respects
4 the states if we do that. And it respects the tribes
5 if we - if there is a similar person we could talk
6 with a little bit.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Max and then George.

8 MR. PETERSON: As George indicated, there is
9 an opportunity, maybe not the best timing, but the -
10 there is a meeting the week of March 15th of the North
11 American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference.
12 It happens to be here in DC.

13 George or I probably could provide an
14 opportunity for a briefing of that group of where we
15 stand. And we could include Tony McDonald in that
16 effort. And at least let them know what we are doing.

17 Because we did spend a lot of time on the tribes the
18 last couple of days. We have not provided that kind
19 of opportunity for formal representation of the
20 states.

21 I think at least if George agrees, he and I
22 can take that on as a task to provide that there be

1 some briefing of where we are and status report and so
2 on, so that we would at least - and we would say to
3 them, we realize we have got more work to do, but at
4 least we would not ignore them.

5 I am sort of uncomfortable with coming forth
6 with a report that there has been no formal
7 involvement of that group with it.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Joe?

9 MR. URAVITCH: Yeah. We have been working
10 with the states all along. But there is another - two
11 more opportunities coming up as well.

12 On April 11th, the state fisheries directors
13 are meeting in St. Petersburg. And I have been asked
14 to address them. But it might be something that you
15 all might want to look at as well.

16 And our next state workshop that - like the
17 one that Rod attended a couple of weeks ago out in
18 California, but this time for the Gulf, the Carribean
19 and the South Atlantic States is going to also be in
20 St. Petersburg on the 12th and 13th.

21 MR. PETERSON: And all fifty states will be
22 here in March. And it will be the directors, not the

1 fisheries people. And sometimes they are the policy
2 people. State directors are the policy people.

3 MR. URAVITCH: Well, for the fisheries and the
4 wildlife agencies. But there is - I mean we are
5 talking about cultural resource agencies. I mean
6 there is - that is one of the issues that we have had
7 to face is the variety of agencies and states that we
8 have to deal with.

9 MR. PETERSON: Anyway, that is just an
10 opportunity next month that I think we should take
11 advantage of.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: This does raise, and I have
13 George and Lelei and now Steve on the agenda. This
14 raises - and Mel. This raises good points. But it
15 also raises sticky points at this stage of our work.

16 And the sticky points are we are now - you
17 know, we are under intense pressure now of our own
18 making to get this thing wrapped up. And so part of
19 it is I am a little - I am not quite sure how.

20 I mean I can understand briefings. I can
21 understand sharing what we have, although it is
22 incomplete. But then if we get feedback and don't

1 have a way to incorporate it back in.

2 So, I - I mean who can be opposed to sort of
3 reaching out to all these group. But operationally I
4 don't know how we do it where we are now. But maybe I
5 misunderstand.

6 MR. PETERSON: I think we have to, Dan. I
7 think if we don't, the whole thing could be DOA if you
8 get united opposition because the report goes forward
9 without adequate consultation. So -

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

11 MR. PETERSON: I think the fact that you
12 provide a briefing, you tell them honestly where we
13 are. You tell them it is still a work in progress.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That is fine.

15 MR. PETERSON: That is the way to do it.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. As long as they
17 don't expect the stuff they tell you, they don't get
18 cross with us because they don't see it show up in our
19 final report that comes out. I think that is the
20 important thing. That they must understand where we
21 are and the operational constraints we have.

22 Okay, we have George, we have Lelei, we have

1 Steve, Mel and Bob Zales and maybe others.

2 MR. LAPOINTE: The - we have mentioned three
3 different groups of state organizations. And it is
4 important that we hit up different ones because Tony
5 McDonald and Coastal States Organization primarily
6 does CZM stuff and does less marine fisheries
7 agencies.

8 The international is primarily fresh water
9 fish and wildlife agencies, with some salt water
10 agencies. And the Atlantic States Commission does
11 otherwise. So, we have to run multiple trap lines, is
12 my point.

13 And I think we should give people briefings
14 to start warming them up to the idea. But I think in
15 terms of - I am with you, Mr. Chairman, we have to
16 finish this report. And we - I mean everybody is
17 going to find something they love to hate in it if
18 they want to.

19 And so I think - I really think one of our
20 recommendations should be a public process for, after
21 we are done, to let people gnaw on it and come back to
22 us. And whoever the next group is, to consider those

1 comments in a formalized way.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I have Lelei, Steve,
3 Mel, Bob Zales and Gil. Lelei?

4 MR. PEAU: Chairman. I was primarily just
5 going to suggest if we decide to - if we decide to
6 liaison with these groups, the Coastal State
7 organization through the Coastal manager will be
8 meeting on March 7th, in two weeks time.

9 And then the US task force will be meeting on
10 March the 3rd. So, I think giving these people a
11 heads up, probably not soliciting comments, but giving
12 them a heads up, a briefing in terms of what progress
13 or work-to-date I think is suffice at this point in
14 time.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: This kind of confirms my hunch
16 that between now and May 17th, there must be thirty
17 organizations that ought to be briefed by us. And
18 there are thirty of us. So, each one of you, I want
19 to hear a volunteer who is going to go brief who.
20 Sorry.

21 There are lots of organizations that want to
22 hear from us. I need to know operationally how we are

1 going to do it. Steve Murray and then Lelei, maybe
2 you deserve a response to my outburst. We have got
3 Lelei, I have got Steve, I have got Mel. I have got
4 Bob Zales. I have Gil. And now Mark. Go ahead,
5 Lelei.

6 MR. PEAU: Mr. Chair, I will be around for the
7 US task force. And I can work with Joe and his people
8 to put together some sort of briefing for the task
9 force.

10 I am also having a scheduled meeting with
11 Tony McDonald next week. I can also assist whoever
12 else is available for that task.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Steve Murray?

14 DR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief.
15 Just wanted to point out that we did get some written
16 comments that related to fears and hopes from Tony
17 McDonald's presentation.

18 And I would just say that it would be nice if
19 the executive committee just glanced over those during
20 the rewrite. Because some of these comments can
21 easily be woven into the context of what we have
22 already produced. And, hence, we have some responses

1 that we are able to generate and put into the
2 document.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I have Mel, Bob
4 Zales, Gil and Mark. Mel?

5 MR. MOON: Yeah, I wanted to respond to the
6 contact with other tribes. And the speakers that we
7 had for the panel represent only a fraction of the
8 tribes that you need to contact. So, we didn't have a
9 tribe's perspective. You had a cross-section of some
10 tribes.

11 So, if - if the idea is to do a full
12 connection, that is going to require a lot more
13 planning.

14 I know from my perspective that we could
15 share this with the Northwest Indian Fisheries
16 Commission, which has twenty tribes that have off-
17 reservation rights that are very interested in hearing
18 what you have to say from my end.

19 And I can do that. I could also perhaps have
20 discussions with the Native American Fish and Wildlife
21 Society. But that would only reach some of the tribes
22 as well. And I am not certain, if I could say that we

1 could have a real good coverage. So, I will do what I
2 can to circulate what is here for the tribes. But it
3 is going to be very limited.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mel. Bob Zales?

5 MR. ZALES: Yeah, I am glad to hear this
6 discussion going on because this is has been a big
7 concern of mine from the very start.

8 And with all deference to George about the
9 Atlantic states and Gulf states and specific states, I
10 can't speak for the Atlantic or the Pacific, but I can
11 say that I don't believe that the Gulf States Marine
12 Fisheries Commission is going to be a good thing to
13 discuss this. Because they act entirely different I
14 think than the rest of them. They only meet two times
15 a year. And I am not so sure that MPAs are going to
16 be a thing that they are going to do.

17 What I intend to do when I get back, I am
18 going to contact my FWC and the head of that
19 organization, the executive director who is in charge
20 of wildlife and fisheries, to try to get a handle on
21 who in the State of Florida is going to play here. To
22 give them a heads up.

1 And then I know who is going to take care of
2 this in the State of Alabama. It will be Roland
3 Mitten, who is their state director for fisheries
4 stuff.

5 So - and in Mississippi, I think I am going
6 to be talking to Bill Walker, who is their natural
7 resources director.

8 So, I am going to make those three states
9 aware of what is going on. And maybe bring the
10 communication back to you all. So -

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. That is good.

12 MR. ZALES: Definitely need to involve those
13 people, though, because due to the fact that - and I
14 don't see this happening, but I see that it could be
15 possible that we could go through this entire process
16 and develop a national system of MPAs. And then you
17 could have some state say well thank you very much but
18 we are going to do our own thing.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks. Gil?

20 MR. RADONSKI: I am looking for some
21 clarification from either Lauren, as our senior - as
22 our federal designated official, or Mary Glackin, who

1 may be able to fill us in. But we are reporting to
2 the Secretaries. And do we go out with this before we
3 report to them? Or, is it their prerogative after we
4 report to them to send it out for formal review to
5 these people?

6 I mean we - I think it needs to be done. I
7 have a deep concern for this. But I - just what you
8 said a minute ago, Chairman, you know, we could go to
9 thirty different groups, forty different groups. We
10 could put this show on the road forever. And I think
11 we need to build this. But I think we have been
12 cognizant of reaching out, to the extent possible. We
13 have identified that we know that there are other
14 entities involved in this issue. Do we report to the
15 Secretaries and then have them send it out? I just
16 want to know what is the proper protocol.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Mary looks like she is willing
18 and Joe, too. Thanks, Gil. Yeah, I am -

19 MR. URAVITCH: Well, I don't think you are
20 going out for formal review. What I hear is you are
21 informing them. As of this meeting, now that there is
22 a draft, that is going to be up on the MPA.gov

1 website. So, that is available to the world.

2 So, I think as a matter of courtesy, you all
3 are talking about going out and informing people that
4 this is going on, this is what you are thinking. And
5 that your report is due in May or June. Mary?

6 MS. GLACKIN: Yeah. And I agree with that,
7 Joe. And I just to go on further, I really support
8 the spirit of what you are trying to do there. But I
9 do share Dan's concern about how to do it.

10 And I think if you go down this path, what I
11 would encourage is that there would be one set of
12 briefing materials. You know, like five slides and
13 then that would be free for anybody to use at your
14 local rotary club or whatever.

15 And - you know -

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I - if I may, I had
17 sort of worried about that. I mean I didn't want to
18 articulate it the way I was going to articulate it.

19 But if we get thirty different people sort of
20 giving their visions of what we are doing, we are
21 going to get thirty-three different impressions of
22 what we are up to. And this could backfire somehow.

1 Not that I don't trust any of us. But if we are going
2 to do this, there needs to be sort of a standard
3 package, I think.

4 Okay. I have Mark. Now I have Jim Ray.
5 Yeah, Gil?

6 MR. RADONSKI: Just one clarification. If we
7 talk to these groups, does that imply that we want
8 feedback right then from them?

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I shouldn't say that.

10 MR. RADONSKI: Okay. Just asking.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. I don't know.

12 MR. PETERSON: We are already - Bonnie did a
13 briefing recently that was a public information and
14 feedback forum.

15 I am going to do one in two weeks that is a
16 public information to the general public out there.
17 Now, surely we should not be doing less to people like
18 the states. We are - this is part of the ongoing
19 process to let people know about it.

20 And I intend to use the same PowerPoint
21 presentation that Bonnie is using. I think it is a
22 good idea to provide pretty standardized information

1 so we don't all put our own spin on it.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this - may I ask, does this
3 presentation describe the questions we are addressing?
4 And how we have structured ourselves? Or does it get
5 into what we think we are going to recommend? Bonnie?

6 DR. McCAY: It does the former.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: The former? Okay. So, this is
8 a process briefing. Here is who we are. Here is who
9 our members are.

10 DR. McCAY: It includes - excuse me, but it
11 does include some of the general principals that we
12 have adopted already that - through the subcommittee
13 process. It refers to each of the subcommittees as
14 some of the highlights.

15 And I want to give Lauren credit. Lauren
16 really put together the framework for that. And then
17 we just fleshed it out.

18 But we - I don't think it is a good idea to
19 come up with all of our recommendations since we don't
20 have those yet.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, we don't have them. Or
22 we won't have them until May.

1 DR. McCAY: But it does give a sense of where
2 we are going. And I think they need that if they want
3 it.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a very different thing
5 from what I thought we were doing. So, okay. I have
6 Mark and Jim Ray and then anyone else. So, Mark?

7 DR. HIXON: Thank you. This follows up
8 exactly - I believe we should have a standardized set
9 of PowerPoint slides for all these presentations.

10 And my second suggestion was going to be
11 whether or not the group as a whole gives its blessing
12 to each individual member to do outreach to whatever
13 group comes along. I mean I have had opportunities to
14 brief the State of Oregon. I haven't taken them up
15 because I didn't know if I had the authority to or
16 not.

17 So, if we have a standardized presentation
18 that we agree to stick with and not go beyond or
19 overextend or add our own personal twist, do we agree
20 that each individual fact member can start providing
21 outreach. Because I also believe that outreach is
22 important.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I must be in the
2 minority here, but I will keep my mouth shut. Jim
3 Ray?

4 DR. RAY: I just wanted to comment, you know,
5 really to what Joe said a minute ago. Is that I would
6 hope on this next draft, seeing as we made so many
7 changes this week, that we get a chance to see the
8 next draft in its entirety and comment back to you
9 before you put it on the website.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Okay. Lauren and then
11 Brian and - are you scratching? Okay.

12 MS. WENZEL: Yeah. The plan is, when
13 something comes out at this meeting, it is public.
14 And so the draft that you all have dated January 21st
15 would be put on the website. Because that is what -
16 publicly available draft now. But anything else will
17 be not public until you all have seen it.

18 But this is a good point. I am glad you
19 raised it. Because if you all would like something to
20 be publicly available before May, then we would
21 probably need to sort of make that decision
22 affirmatively, based on, you know, the draft that we

1 will have in the interim.

2 DR. RAY: Yeah, my concern is that we have
3 made substantive changes this week. And I would like
4 to see the document in its entirety in the next
5 version before it goes out on the website.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: I am very - yeah, I am with
7 you, Jim. I am very reluctant. I have no trouble
8 with what Bonnie presented. I have no trouble with
9 procedural. Here is how we are organized. Here is
10 the challenges that we have been handed by the
11 departments. Here is our membership. Here are the
12 interests they seem to represent. This is process.
13 No trouble with that. And here are the people we have
14 heard from. Yes, we haven't heard from everyone, but
15 we have heard from all of these folks.

16 Beyond that, I get very nervous. Until this
17 whole group has had a chance to sign off on something.
18 And it is at that time, I believe, that we then put
19 together a briefing package about our first two years
20 worth of work.

21 And then there would be less on process and
22 more on substantive findings. I am sorry. Brian and

1 then Terry.

2 DR. MELZIAN: Just based on experiences with
3 Ocean.US executive committee and also within EPA. If
4 you do post any draft reports on the website, and
5 there are some merits for that, you really need to
6 make it very, very clear that this is a draft working
7 document.

8 Because we have found from our experiences
9 that if you don't do that, there will be those out
10 there interpreting it as final and statement.

11 Secondly, even though this committee has done
12 its very best, and I think it has done an excellent
13 job of being all-inclusive and trying to represent an
14 entire country, point of fact, it has not - it will
15 not represent the entire country.

16 And how this could be addressed is after the
17 final report is submitted to the Department of
18 Commerce and Department of Interior, and this is not
19 as onerous as it may seem, it could then be announced,
20 if these agencies chose to do so. It is not a
21 recommendation, I am just sort of giving a process to
22 get it codified.

1 It could then be made available in the
2 Federal Register. And give the entire nation a one
3 month time period to respond.

4 During which, at that time, I know our
5 agencies and others - all Indian tribes could be
6 contacted, everyone who has not been part of the
7 process to date, would have a one month time period to
8 give comments back to those agencies.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. That - Mary, you can
10 tell me, but it seems to me that is for the Secretary
11 of Interior and Secretary of Commerce to decide. We
12 just hand them our stuff. Let's - Terry and then Bob
13 Zales.

14 MR. O'HALLORAN: Well, I really like this
15 discussion because I think what we are talking about
16 is one of our core values, which is reaching out and
17 making sure that people understand what we are doing,
18 why we are doing it.

19 We can't tell them exactly what we have done
20 because we haven't really accomplished that yet. And
21 I recognize that.

22 And I really liked Joe's comment about the

1 website. We have been putting the minutes to our
2 meetings on the website. So, I don't think we are
3 talking about putting our - a draft document that we
4 haven't really approved or really done on the website.

5 I think we are talking about our minutes to
6 our meeting. So, it is not just a privilege public
7 that are here at this moment, but anybody of the
8 public can read and hear what went on here in the last
9 three days.

10 And that we have an ability - because unlike
11 Mark, I just assumed that it was okay for me to talk
12 about what we are doing here. And so I have talked to
13 the people in our state about what we are doing.

14 And I have not been able to tell them what we
15 have accomplished because it is a work in progress.
16 But I have informed them about where we are and kind
17 of the direction we are going.

18 And so I mean when I made my comment, that is
19 really what I am - I don't - I think we are all in
20 agreement that blind-siding anyone here gives a
21 perception that we are trying to exclude them. And
22 that is not - I know that is not our intention.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Okay. I think we are
2 reaching some agreement here. Bob and then maybe we
3 should stop this. Go ahead, Bob.

4 MR. ZALES: And I agree with Jim and also
5 you, Dan, that if this current draft hasn't been
6 posted yet, I think I would advise against posting it.
7 Substantial changes that appear to be coming out in
8 the next one.

9 And I am not so sure I would put the next one
10 out there until it kind of leaves us as a final
11 document going to the two Secretaries. Because I
12 think all that does it just anybody that is on the
13 website and looking, it just adds that kind of
14 confusion to it.

15 And, on top of that, if you are not real
16 careful on when you put that on there and it is in a
17 format that could possibly be printed somehow, if it
18 doesn't have draft clearly imprinted in the paper,
19 people could throw this out. This is the document.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

21 MR. ZALES: And you could have individuals out
22 here trying to screw this process up by doing that.

1 So, I think you need to be real careful about how this
2 is done.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mary has an eager look
4 on her face. And then we are going to change the
5 subject.

6 MS. GLACKIN: Well, no, I was going to ask
7 Lauren. Doesn't that have to go on the website?
8 Isn't that part of our open and public process?

9 MS. WENZEL: It has to be public, which means
10 we have to make it available if anyone wants it. I
11 don't we have an affirmative requirement to put it on
12 the website. But typically we do because that is our
13 way of making it public.

14 MS. GLACKIN: I will just say one more word.
15 Watermarks are great for draft things. I like them.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Okay. Yes, Max?

17 MR. PETERSON: Let me just express a little
18 concern about where we seem to be going. By law,
19 advisory committee meetings all must be open to the
20 public. So, anybody from the unwashed public could
21 walk in here and listen to everything. They could see
22 all these draft we are handing out.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

2 MR. PETERSON: And so I think to put it on the
3 web and mark it draft, watermark it draft is the only
4 honorable thing to do. Because otherwise we are
5 providing a privilege to people who could afford to
6 come to Washington.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

8 MR. PETERSON: And if I am sitting out there
9 in Bar Harbor, Maine and I want to comment on this, I
10 should have the privilege of doing that. So, I think
11 we just need to be honest that this is a draft. It is
12 a work in progress. We need to be as open as we can.
13 And I just abhor the idea we are going to kind of
14 keep it in secret. I think it is wrong.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. That is a fine point.
16 Jim, you do get the last word.

17 DR. RAY: Well, again, I agree completely,
18 Max. It is a totally open process and people should
19 be able to see it. But the work product, for example,
20 this next draft, which we haven't seen yet as
21 committee members who are creating this, we need to at
22 least see the draft in its entirety and have an

1 opportunity to report back to our executive committee
2 as to whether or not it, in fact, reflects what we
3 have discussed before we put it out on a website.

4 MR. PETERSON: We are in agreement on that.

5 DR. RAY: Okay. All right. I just want to be
6 sure we are in agreement on that.

7 MR. PETERSON: No, we are not talking about
8 that.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right. Could I ask
10 Lauren to declare at what date this will go on the
11 website?

12 MS. WENZEL: I wasn't quite prepared to do
13 that. But I guess -

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, what are we talking
15 about. I mean at what stage can it?

16 MS. WENZEL: Right. Things are public when
17 they are distributed to the FAC for consideration at a
18 public meeting. So, as of this meeting, the January
19 31st draft is public. And so we would typically post
20 that on our website as the public draft, even though
21 it is going to be revised. And we would probably just
22 put a note on it and say, you know, draft and it is

1 being revised. But this is the current public draft.

2 And then do the same at the May meeting.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: You have answered the question.

4 That is it. April 29th is the next time this
5 document can go on the website. Jim? Right?

6 Do I read this correctly, Lauren? You said
7 when it is ready to go to a committee - back to us for
8 deliberation, that is when it can be posted. Huh?

9 MS. WENZEL: Yes.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Jim, that answers your concern,
11 doesn't it? April 29th, that is the one that gets
12 posted. Am I correct? No?

13 MS. WENZEL: Typically we have done it on the
14 day the FAC meeting starts.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. But it will be the thing
16 that has - that we will see as of the 29th of April
17 and the public will not see it until the 17th of May.

18 Are we in agreement on this? I am sorry. Okay.
19 Michael?

20 DR. CRUICKSHANK: Will there be a draft final?

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it will be a draft. This
22 is called a draft synthesis report. That will be a

1 draft final report. Won't it?

2 All right. It is four o'clock. Lauren, what
3 - we, in a sense, have done everything up to 4:30
4 committee business. And maybe we have done some of
5 that.

6 Lauren, can you help us walk through? Review
7 key agenda items for the May meeting. Have we done
8 this?

9 Do we know who we want to hear from? Do we
10 know who we want to come speak with us? Okay, go
11 ahead.

12 MS. WENZEL: As far as key agenda items, this
13 has come up previously at FAC meetings. And it came
14 up at the federal agency meeting. Wish to hear from
15 folks who have an emphasis on natural heritage. We
16 have heard a lot about cultural heritage and heard a
17 lot about sustainable production.

18 And I heard from some members at past
19 meetings that they felt that natural heritage could
20 benefit from some additional emphasis.

21 And there was also a desire from site
22 managers at the federal agency meeting to share their

1 experiences with the FAC.

2 And so the thought we had was to put together
3 some panel of site managers who are focusing on
4 natural heritage from sanctuaries program, perhaps
5 parks, refuges.

6 We have heard from the people at the very top
7 of Interior and NOAA. Kind of giving you a broad
8 overview of the programs, but not the folks as much
9 who are actually doing the day-to-day management.

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. I have Bob Zales
11 and then George.

12 MR. ZALES: At one point I think at the last
13 meeting there was discussion about having a panel. I
14 think Bonnie brought this up, of commercial and
15 recreational representatives from their respective
16 sectors to discuss their perspectives. And possibly
17 even divers - support divers for things like this.

18 And I am assuming, because from our
19 discussions, the two councils that are left, they will
20 be invited to give their perspectives at this next
21 meeting.

22 So, I don't know. The panel of fishermen, I

1 guess, for lack of a better thing. Is there going to
2 be something along that line? Or what happens then?
3 Where Bonnie suggested it.

4 MR. RADONSKI: I would agree with Bob. I
5 mean we have had - we have had tribal at this meeting.
6 We had tribal in Hawaii. I think some of these other
7 aspects, users should be addressed as well.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: The dive community?

9 MR. ZALES: Well, the divers and the
10 commercial fishermen.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: The recreational community,
12 which then is fishing and diving and other stuff,
13 right?

14 MR. ZALES: In Hawaii, Bonnie had mentioned
15 something about a committee being formed up. And I
16 had asked about that committee. And she said I could
17 be on it. And I didn't hear anything other than we
18 weren't going to do it. So, I need to know where that
19 is.

20 DR. McCAY: Are you addressing me? Well, the
21 two presentations we had from the groups in western
22 pacific and then today the tribes were a part of the

1 outcome of that. The third group that has not been
2 represented are those people whose lives have been
3 vested in commercial recreational fishing. And this
4 has been an issue.

5 Finding the time for that, deciding how we
6 could ensure fair representation are big issues.

7 I personally believe we need to do that. I
8 think that commercial fishing and recreational fishing
9 are represented by membership on this committee, to
10 some extent, but so are the other interests. But it
11 would be good if we could find the time now.

12 I mean they are the people who have probably
13 the most direct interest in the outcomes of any kind
14 of enhancement of MPAs. You know, in terms of
15 affecting their activities.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. I have George, I have
17 Mark and I have Terry.

18 I guess what I would like to do is try to
19 drive the discussion in the direction of specifics
20 about when we say recreation users, who is it. Help
21 me understand this.

22 If I stay at home and reflect fondly on the

1 marine environment and habitat and sleep soundly
2 because I know it is being improved, am I a user?
3 Okay, so what is a user here? What is an interest
4 group?

5 I would like some guidance here. And then
6 ultimately we are going to have to deputize some
7 people to put together a program.

8 So, George, Mark and Terry?

9 MR. LAPOINTE: I mentioned before, Mr.
10 Chairman, and I am going to still argue for a
11 minimalist approach.

12 Lauren mentioned natural heritage kind of
13 people, site managers. We have talked about
14 commercial and recreational fishermen. We have talked
15 about the New England and Gulf Council. We have
16 talked about the states.

17 That is five different groups. Put two hours
18 a piece, roughly an hour and a half and we have used
19 up our meeting and we will not have time to get our
20 work done. We will not have time to plan for our next
21 work. This means no disrespect. I mean I work for a
22 state and I have worked for a lot of states.

1 But we are running out of time. I mean if we
2 want to, again, make recommendations that this be held
3 in limbo until the next MPA FAC II, so that in fact we
4 can continue to get people's opinions, that is good.

5 But I mean we have already largely filled our
6 - about half of our agenda with presentations.

7 It is all interesting. But, again, the
8 return for unit effort for making substantive changes
9 to this report, I think we are supposed to finish in
10 May, strikes me as less than good use of our time.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Could I just ask a point
12 of information. You said we have already committed
13 half of our agenda? Did you say that?

14 MR. LAPOINTE: We would.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, we would? Okay. At the
16 moment we have what? What do we have in the way of
17 moral commitments? A couple of remaining fisheries
18 management council reps? Who else?

19 MR. LAPOINTE: We - I have heard discussion of
20 natural heritage kind of people.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, but I mean, let me back
22 up. Of prior moral commitments. I mean we made a

1 prior commitment to some - to the fisheries
2 management. That is the prior moral commitment under
3 which we labor. Now we are looking at some new ones.

4 MR. LAPOINTE: I guess there was a - Max, was
5 it a semi-moral commitment to hearing from more
6 states?

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, I don't know, but
8 okay. All right. That is good. Mark and Terry.
9 Mark?

10 DR. HIXON: My understanding is the fisheries
11 management councils deal with both recreational and
12 commercial fishing. So, I - I just don't know if that
13 is going to add as much new information to us, as much
14 as other stakeholder groups we haven't heard of.
15 Recreational use that is not fishing, for example. I
16 am sort of just echoing George. I am feeling a bit
17 saturated at this point. Thank you.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Terry?

19 MR. O'HALLORAN: When I looked at the list of
20 committee members, the one pager, there was Ocean
21 Recreation by my name. And I am torn here. Because
22 we do need to hear from various sectors that I don't

1 believe we have heard from, such as the scuba diving
2 and such as other ocean tourism and recreational
3 users. I think that is really important. And I think
4 we owe it to them. And I think it will be of value to
5 us.

6 And where I am torn is I think we are close
7 here and we have got a commitment to getting this
8 thing that is done on a timely manner.

9 So, I believe I agree a hundred percent with
10 what Bob said, that we need to do it. And I guess the
11 question that I have is when. And I think we need
12 time to identify users.

13 When we start talking about recreational and
14 ocean tourism, we have got one of the more fragmented
15 industries and groups around the country. There are
16 very few organizations that really represent all of
17 them.

18 Like we don't have regional fishery councils.
19 And so it gets real difficult in saying who is going
20 to be chosen to sit on a panel that represents those
21 interests on a national basis.

22 Anyway. Those are just some comments.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let me ask this. And I
2 have Gil on the list here. What are the - when we say
3 we haven't heard from people, I seem to remember in
4 the public comment period hearing from interests that
5 we have not had a panel for. Does this qualify as
6 hearing from? Doesn't qualify?

7 DR. HIXON: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that
8 it really does. Because we have heard from some
9 individuals who are representing their particular
10 group. But I think that in a more formal manner, at
11 the right time. And I think that that will be
12 important and very valuable to us to hear from these
13 guys.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me ask. If we put some
15 parameters on something. So we are going to meet for
16 three days and if we say two days will be devoted to
17 hard work on our document. That gives us a day. It
18 doesn't mean all the same day.

19 But, okay, sixteen hours on the document?
20 My, God, and eight hours to hear from other people.
21 Do you like that time allocation or do you want half
22 and half? How do you - let's start parameterizing

1 what we have got to work with. Jim had his hand up
2 and then George and Terry and Dolly and Max.

3 DR. RAY: Well, I am being brave in saying I
4 think I am in George's camp. I am really getting
5 concerned with the amount of time. I mean, you know,
6 if we were going to try to have presentations from
7 every possible user group and stakeholder group, we
8 should have determined that when we first started this
9 committee.

10 We haven't heard from the extractive
11 industries group. We haven't heard from the military.
12 We haven't heard from the oil and gas industry. I
13 mean we can just keep building on the list if you want
14 to bring in different people to talk to us.

15 In my mind, this is a very diverse panel that
16 was very carefully selected to represent a very broad
17 section of the users of the marine environment.

18 So between the combination of the expertise
19 on this committee and the very good briefings we have
20 had from fisheries management councils, from the
21 various native groups and tribal groups, I think we
22 have had a pretty good broad cross-section. I am just

1 really concerned that we really need to focus our time
2 in trying to get our initial commitment to get this
3 report done. I am just getting concerned.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Jim, is that? I mean
5 can I just follow up with Jim a minute. Would you
6 like to see us have two days to work on the document,
7 Jim?

8 DR. RAY: The more time the better.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: The more time the better.

10 DR. RAY: To work the document so that we can
11 really have the time for breakouts and everything
12 else. Because we are going to get down to the real
13 nitty gritty on this last go around.

14 You know, where there is going to be areas
15 that people have concern on. And we are going to have
16 to take time to get it worked out. To build our
17 consensus. And so I want to be sure we have enough
18 time to really have those discussions to resolve any
19 issues and problems.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: I share that entirely. My
21 sense was, and I wasn't involved in them, but my sense
22 was, when we broke out in these new ad hoc groups, it

1 was an exciting thing because in a sense you were now
2 sitting down with people who you had not really
3 interacted with because they had been on another
4 subcommittee.

5 And I think the end product of these ad hoc
6 things has been fantastic. I think our document is
7 much richer. It is much more complete. And we may
8 end up having to do a bit of that again in May.

9 So, Dolly has her hand up. I am looking - I
10 think your hand is up, Dolly. I am looking - Tundi
11 and Max. We need - lets - give me some guidelines
12 about the agenda.

13 DR. GARZA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would
14 support two days for wrapping up our document.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Two days for wrapping up the
16 document.

17 DR. GARZA: In terms of the other councils,
18 while we may have agreed that we are going to listen
19 to them, there is nothing that said we are going to
20 listen to them by the end of this round. And so, as
21 far as I am concerned, they could be pushed to beyond
22 May.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

2 DR. GARZA: We are trying to figure out who to
3 get rid of. I agree with natural heritage and the
4 site managers, as a panel. And perhaps on the other
5 one we could have someone from the tour industry,
6 someone from the dive industry, someone from nature.
7 And so it would be a bit of a hodgepodge. But it
8 might pull them together.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Gil, I have you
10 down. Did you -

11 MR. RADONSKI: No.

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: I have got Max, Tundi, George
13 and Bob Zales. Max?

14 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I think we are in
15 a bind here that there is no easy way out. And I
16 would suggest that we use these information and
17 feedback sessions.

18 I think we ought to deputize anybody on this
19 to - like Bob Zales to go meet with people. Jim? And
20 to say here is where we stand. And invite their
21 involvement.

22 I think to - I think to invite a bunch of

1 feedback in May in Maine when we are closing in on a
2 final document is a little bit of a subterfuge. I
3 don't think we are going to be open to a lot of
4 changes.

5 So, I would use these information and
6 feedback forums ahead of time to the members of this
7 group so that they can provide it.

8 For example, Mike Nussman, who just left, is
9 the president of the American Sport Fishing
10 Association. Mike, why don't you set up an
11 information and feedback session with the sport
12 fishing organization.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

14 MR. PETERSON: Deputize him to do that and
15 listen to him. He will have time for that.

16 So, I think we have to use the FAC members to
17 do this. I don't think you can do it in Maine.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Okay.

19 MR. PETERSON: I think it is too late. I
20 think it will come across that we are just kind of
21 patting them on the head and we are not going to
22 listen to them anyway.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Tundi, George and Bob
2 Zales. And then we will stop and take stock. Okay?
3 Tundi?

4 DR. AGARDY: Yeah. I agree with Jim and Max.
5 And I think the really critical input is going to
6 come a little bit later in the second iteration of
7 this committee when we actually talk about how to
8 develop the system, as opposed to the vision for the
9 system.

10 And I don't really see - I don't see much
11 potential for any user group coming forward and being
12 so vehemently opposed to our collective vision here
13 that we would have to rewrite this document. I think
14 we will have to rely on them for advice on how to move
15 forward from here.

16 And I think we need time in Maine set aside
17 to think about next steps. We - don't forget, it is
18 not just the report, we need to think about how we are
19 going to answer these questions of the planning
20 process and site selection.

21 And I just also want to point out that the
22 environmental NGO community has also not been heard

1 from.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

3 DR. AGARDY: And some of us represent that
4 community but can't speak for the whole community.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is right. Okay, I have
6 got George and Bob Zales.

7 MR. LAPOINTE: I have said enough, Mr.
8 Chairman, thank you.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Bob?

10 MR. ZALES: I am just going to put this on the
11 record. At the end of the Hawaii meeting, I left
12 there with the impression and Bonnie can correct me if
13 I am wrong, but I left there with the impression that,
14 when we talked about the councils, there were four
15 councils remaining and they were going to be invited
16 to the next meeting.

17 At some point that was changed to where the
18 two councils were done and e-mails back and forth to
19 some of the staff. I was informed that the other two
20 councils would come in May.

21 The issue about the commercial and
22 recreational stakeholders being invited was also

1 discussed then. And while I wasn't able to enjoy the
2 extra day in Hawaii because I had to leave, there is
3 going to be an extra day attached here.

4 I didn't ask to be put on this panel as - to
5 be used as a travel agent to see the world. You talk
6 about three days. We are going to do a fourth day as
7 a fun day. So, when I hear that we don't have time to
8 do this, that bothers me. So, I just want that on the
9 record. That these people are not being I guess
10 considered properly in my mind due to time constraints
11 which I see being used elsewhere. So -

12 MR. CHAIRMAN: Bonnie?

13 DR. McCAY: I agree that these were the
14 understandings. In fact, our decision to go to New
15 England was predicated on meeting - being close to the
16 New England Fishery Management Council. And we had
17 put off having representation from recreational and
18 commercial fisherman.

19 A possible way of doing this is to arrange
20 our Friday to have participation - Barbara and others
21 help to - and George helped design it so that we can
22 interact with - have some meetings with

1 representatives of the recreational and commercial
2 fishing industry in the Portland area.

3 That is a possible way of handling this.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let me - Bob is right.
5 And that is sort of what I meant by prior moral
6 commitment. We did make that decision that we would
7 hear from all the fisheries management councils. And
8 I - to state my view, I think we should live up to
9 that obligation.

10 It is now a bit late to decide that we don't
11 think it is a good use of our time. And I think,
12 Lauren, that is in a sense the only sort of
13 outstanding commitment that we have made. Is that
14 right?

15 And I think we had better live with it.
16 Okay? Regardless of what you think of it, we - Bob is
17 right in the sense of the way that was dealt with and
18 other things started to intrude.

19 And maybe we shouldn't have made that
20 commitment, but we did. And I think we - I believe we
21 have some obligation to live up to it.

22 I think - what I would like to do, though, is

1 keep the fun day off the table. I am sorry it even
2 came up. Okay? We don't have fun on this task force
3 or committee. We work our tail off.

4 So, lets just leave the fourth day of fun out
5 for a minute. We are talking about how we are going
6 to dedicate three days inside of a room listening to
7 people. And that we do have a moral commitment to
8 listen to the last two remaining fisheries management
9 councils. And I don't see why we can't do it.

10 I don't think we want to bump it off, Bob.

11 Okay?

12 The issue then is who else do we have time to
13 hear from. But I think we must go forward with that.

14 MR. RADONSKI: Mr. Chairman, however you
15 handle it, make sure you listen to these groups before
16 we adopt the report. Because if we adopt the report
17 and then listen to them, it is not going to look good.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, well that is - I mean Bob
19 will remind us that he has warned us about this. You
20 know, what the hell are you going to do? You are
21 going to ask them to come in May while you -

22 MR. ZALES: That was my point.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: I know, Bob. I know.

2 MR. ZALES: You were going to ask two
3 councils. In my mind, and I don't do anything in New
4 England, but I know enough about the New England
5 council that they are heavily weighted commercial and
6 they have got a lot of serious problems there. And I
7 know what their recreational and commercial fisheries
8 are. And they - I know that the Gulf council had and
9 has a lot to contribute because of areas that they
10 have designated as what I would consider MPAs.

11 And this whole discussion, it didn't start
12 two months ago. I didn't start a while back. This is
13 something that I have brought to this table from day
14 one. That these people should be considered. And you
15 should never get to the end point to where you are
16 taking final action and then you are going to listen
17 to somebody and try to change your mind.

18 If you are trying to do something for public
19 stakeholder and we are saying we want all this
20 information. You don't say, okay, well, we are here
21 to the final - we are going to vote tomorrow, but now
22 you tell us what you want to do today. We may change

1 it. That doesn't look good.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, but we are a bit boxed in
3 in terms of schedule. I mean if we have this. Let me
4 ask you this. Are we obligated to have a public
5 input, public listening, whatever Dana manages?

6 MR. URAVITCH: Yes.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: Have to have one of those?

8 MR. URAVITCH: Yes.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: At least one? We could have
10 one of those on the first day. We could have the
11 panel, the last fisheries management councils we
12 haven't heard from, we could have them on the first
13 day. I know, Bob, it doesn't fix it entirely, but it
14 is better than having them the last day. Okay?

15 So, we have them on the first day. We have
16 our public comment period on the first day. And then
17 maybe we have time for one other sort of thing. And I
18 believe that is it.

19 Dolly? Your hand is up? I have Dolly.
20 Yeah, Dolly, go ahead.

21 DR. GARZA: Right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22 I would agree to have that regional advisory council

1 panel on the first day, the public comment on the
2 first day and then that would be it for panels.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: You would kind of like to shut
4 it down?

5 DR. GARZA: Because as Tundi pointed out, I
6 mean we have to do our document. And we have to plan
7 for the next round. And that will take some work.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. George? Lauren?

9 MS. WENZEL: Just two quick comments. One is
10 just to make you all aware that the FAC is obviously a
11 really important piece of input that NOAA and Interior
12 are going to use as we move forward.

13 But we are also in the process of developing
14 this framework document, which I think the FAC
15 recommendations will be an enormous help and you will
16 probably see a lot of familiar language when you read
17 that framework document. Because I think we are
18 really going to be relying on you.

19 But, in addition to the fact, we are also
20 going out around the country to a few places to do
21 these public feedback and information sessions. And
22 that is what Max mentioned. And so there are sort of

1 ongoing opportunities, beyond June for people to have
2 input.

3 And I think it is going to be important for
4 us to frame kind of how this process is going to work
5 to avoid what Bob Zales was telling us about, this
6 appearance that, you know, the door is closed because
7 it is not.

8 And not only does the framework process go
9 on, but obviously the FAC process goes on. And you
10 all will have a whole new round of charges and things
11 to consider.

12 So, I think we just need to do a really good
13 job of communicating where we are in the process and
14 how this input is going to be used.

15 And I also just wanted to mention that this
16 has been a really busy, intense meeting. And I am
17 sure the Portland meeting will be similar. We are
18 also thinking about doing a public information and
19 feedback session at the Portland meeting, which is not
20 necessarily sort of a FAC - a part of the FAC meeting.
21 It is a part of the broader process.

22 But obviously it would be at the same time

1 and with you all present. So, that is just another
2 opportunity to get stakeholder input in this process.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Terry?

4 MR. O'HALLORAN: Thank you, Lauren. I think I
5 like your words of wisdom there. And about all these
6 other efforts are going on.

7 Two comments. You know, I think that Tundi
8 mentioned that some of these ocean tourism and other
9 groups, I do think we need to hear from them. But,
10 frankly, I think that a lot of them aren't going to
11 have a lot of trouble with where we are right now.
12 And I think that the implementation stage is a real
13 good place for them to start talking to us about that.

14 My other comment is about the fourth days of
15 our meetings. Now, those have been field trips. We
16 had one in Florida. We had one in Hawaii. And we had
17 both of those field trips, I felt like were very
18 educational. And if you had fun on those, that is
19 your own problem. But they were very meaningful.

20 And I think helped us learn a lot more about
21 what we are doing here. So, I just don't like the
22 idea that we characterize this as a day off for fun.

1 I think part of it - we learned a lot at both of
2 those. And I hope we continue to do them.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay people whispering in my
4 ear that they agree. I don't know what they are
5 agreeing to.

6 Okay, let me see if I can crystalize this.
7 We are going to have day one. And Lauren has given a
8 bit of thought to this. And what if day one looked
9 like this?

10 We would have a time for document review.
11 That is to say we will have had it. We could have a
12 period, perhaps all morning, in which we somehow
13 structure a conversation about what you have in your
14 hands and how you think you wish to proceed.

15 We could have a public comment period, one
16 hour that day. We are required to have one public
17 comment period of unspecified length. Could we have a
18 ten minute one? I doubt it. One hour? Huh?

19 And then we could have our fisheries
20 management councils panel of some sort. And that
21 would be on the first day. Huh?

22 So, morning, look at the document, the

1 afternoon we have these two things.

2 And then day two could be for document review
3 and further work. Document - I mean day three would
4 be looking forward. Part of which may need - we still
5 may need that for mop up work on the document. But it
6 would be wonderful if we could have the bulk of that
7 third day for a conversation about new directions, new
8 charge, new issues to address. Huh?

9 And how is that? Is that, at this moment,
10 does that feel about right? Yes, Bonnie?

11 DR. McCAY: I - yeah, it feels all right.
12 Except I really do want to second what was just said
13 about the day four. That isn't a fun jaunt. In both
14 cases, we really learned a tremendous amount. And I
15 would assume that that would happen in this case, too.

16 And that is where we should intentionally
17 structure in opportunities to learn more about some of
18 these other communities that are very central to this.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I am sorry. Maybe I made
20 too much of the fun thing. I was - I mean - yeah. I
21 didn't mean it is frivolous. I don't know. We do
22 need opportunities to do that. Whether those things,

1 whether we can treat them as official inputs into our
2 deliberations, I don't know. But we will work that
3 out. I am sorry, I didn't mean to put it down as
4 frivolity.

5 Michael and then Bob.

6 DR. CRUICKSHANK: I - a thought here. Because
7 I hadn't realized what I should have done that the
8 Federal Register is a very, very widespread request
9 for feedback on these things. Is it possible that we
10 have time, after we have finalized at the May meeting,
11 to put that document into the Federal Register and ask
12 for a response?

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know how to answer the
14 question. And I am not the one to answer it. And I
15 think that is for further deliberation. But, no,
16 Michael, I am sorry, Mary just fainted over there.
17 No, I don't think so. I am sorry. I think that is a
18 conversation I would like you to have with Mary and
19 come back and talk about it, but I don't think so.

20 MR. ZALES: I want everybody to be sure and
21 understand where I am coming from. I am not
22 complaining about fun days, because I think that they

1 were educational and helped people understand more
2 about the environment and what was going on.

3 Where I am coming from with that is, that in
4 constituents that sometimes I represent and sometimes
5 that I see, perception plays big. And perception is
6 not always reality. And so when people are kind of
7 made to feel that they have been shunned in a process
8 that they felt like they should have been a part of,
9 and advertised that they would have been a part of,
10 and then they hear about a trip where a bunch of
11 people went snorkeling to learn something, perception
12 could be that, oh, this is just a fun vacation and
13 they were excluded because of that.

14 And I just don't want to be party to a
15 committee that is viewed that way. And so that is
16 where I come from in what I am saying.

17 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. And in that sense I
18 think it is important. Perceptions are profound. And
19 I - that is why I think despite how nice it would be
20 to get a break in the middle, I think we need three
21 hard days of work. This is still a Calvinist society
22 we live in. We need to really sweat bullets for three

1 days.

2 The fourth day, I would prefer to see it
3 arranged perhaps as the way it was with Terry. That
4 it is a voluntary extra day, that it is not part of
5 our charge. But maybe then MNFS can't pay for
6 something that it would otherwise pay for.

7 I don't know how to do this.

8 MR. ZALES: It is a field trip.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a field trip. Whatever.
10 This can be done. But, yeah, we need three hard days
11 of work. And then a field trip, not fun. An
12 unpleasant field trip.

13 MR. LAPOINTE: The unpleasantness is the
14 snorkeling in May in Maine.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN: Bonnie says a storm. That does
16 it. Okay. We are not going to have fun. We are
17 going to suffer out there.

18 MR. LAPOINTE: We will make everybody throw
19 up.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So, Lauren? Where are
21 we? Do you want to cast some dates up into the wind?
22 Are you ready for that? Lauren tried with the two

1 dates to you. And it turns out that one of those was
2 not very good. So, Lauren, could we?

3 MS. WENZEL: Yeah, I don't -

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't ask you for
5 commitments now from your calendar, which you may not
6 have. But we want to give you a heads up with the
7 dates.

8 MS. WENZEL: Yeah. And I will poll you
9 because I didn't expect everyone to be prepared. But
10 we are now looking for the fall meeting at November
11 1st through the 3rd or November 15th through the 17th.
12 And I had polled you all on the 15th through 17th,
13 but not on the 1st through the 3rd. The October date
14 didn't look good for most people or more people.

15 So, I just wanted to let you know those are
16 the two sets of dates we are looking at for the fall
17 meeting. And I will poll you all by e-mail.

18 MR. ZALES: Where?

19 MS. WENZEL: I believe we are talking about
20 possibly the Gulf.

21 MR. BENDICK: St. Anne's Corpus Christie at
22 the Gulf States meeting. It might be a good thing.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that is a possibility.
2 And if we are going to do that in May, we could talk
3 about how we use that venue with those people who will
4 be there. Yeah.

5 MR. ZALES: If you would please share it
6 because undoubtedly I missed that e-mail, too, because
7 I haven't seen anything for that period of time.

8 MS. WENZEL: I will.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Any parting shots? Thoughts?
10 Yes, Steven?

11 DR. MURRAY: I just want to encapsulate my
12 understanding of the way that we proceeded with the
13 regard to having folks come in and give us some
14 learning experiences.

15 I thought that really early in this process,
16 maybe one of our first meetings, that we all either
17 formally or informally collectively decided that we
18 needed to learn some more things, particularly about
19 the different cultural issues that we felt we needed
20 to be more learned about. And I thought that we were
21 able to do that through a series of really excellent
22 presentations.

1 I thought that we also decided that, because
2 of the key role that fisheries councils play in these
3 activities, that we needed to hear and learn from the
4 different fisheries councils. So, I - and I think we
5 have done that. And I am glad to see that you are
6 looking at including the other fishery councils on the
7 agenda.

8 And then I thought the third thing was that
9 we needed to hear and learn from the different
10 perspectives of the various agencies and departments
11 that have been involved at different levels in this.
12 And I think we have uniformly done that.

13 I think that for us to think that we could
14 hear presentations from every single possible
15 constituency group in the time frame of three or four
16 meetings, it is just not possible.

17 So, I think we have been very consistent with
18 regard to what my understanding was that we set out
19 and identified as what we needed to most hear. And I
20 think we have done a nice job of doing that. I would
21 just like to go on the record of making that comment.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Lelei? Did you have your hand

1 up, Lelei?

2 MR. PEAU: Well, I was just looking at my
3 calendar. It seems like if we meet in Texas, that
4 would be two meetings in the East Coast. And I
5 thought we were operating in the understanding that we
6 -

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think you want to tell
8 a Texan that that is the East Coast.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe from Samoa it might look
11 awfully east. But -

12 MR. PEAU: So, I propose that we meet
13 somewhere in the south.

14 MR. CHAIRMAN: The south?

15 MR. PEAU: South Pacific.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, the South Pacific.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. CHAIRMAN: Boy, you give these guys Hawaii
19 and now they want Samoa. Right? Camels under the
20 nose. That is - we will duly record that, Lelei. I
21 can't tell you how badly many of us would love to do
22 that. We will figure it out.

1 Dolly? Here comes the vote for Alaska.

2 DR. GARZA: Right. That is right. I don't
3 know how Texas got ahead of us, since we are bigger.
4 We need to go to Alaska and the Northwest, both,
5 because they are very different ecosystems and
6 dynamics.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN: I know that. Yeah. As we look
8 ahead, yes, the - we must come to Alaska. Go to
9 Alaska. And, Dolly, I think February is not a good
10 time to do that. But May? How is May? Better or
11 next November?

12 DR. GARZA: If it were in May, it would need
13 to be early in May, otherwise we will have tourist
14 coming in and really hiked up rates for anything and
15 issues with availability.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

17 DR. GARZA: I did speak with Wallie Perera and
18 Dave Benton and we had thought we would be inviting
19 you to Sitka at the next meeting, with a beautiful
20 location.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Uh-huh.

22 DR. GARZA: But again, Texas beat us.

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: Which time of year would be -
2 would you -

3 DR. GARZA: Early May.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN: Early May of '06?

5 DR. GARZA: Or late April. Pardon?

6 MR. CHAIRMAN: Of '06? 2006?

7 DR. GARZA: Yeah, let's scrape Maine, we will
8 just say '06. Scrap Maine.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN: Scrap Maine? Oh, yes. John?

10 DR. HALSEY: There is the north coast.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN: The north coast. Yeah, that is
12 right. Yeah.

13 DR. HALSEY: I think at some point, and I
14 don't know exactly where each site, certainly this
15 committee - certainly some time in the next year -

16 MR. CHAIRMAN: Cycle.

17 DR. HALSEY: Next cycle, there should be a
18 meeting somewhere in the Great Lakes.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Great Lakes.

20 DR. HALSEY: And I would certainly think
21 Michigan would be the logical place.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, Wisconsin is better, but

1 Michigan - I would rather -

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. CHAIRMAN: I would rather have you do the
4 work, so I vote for Michigan. No, that is right. I
5 mean we have been aware of that. We do need to do the
6 north coast. As you say, we have done the left and
7 right coast and now we have got to do the left coast.
8 So, yeah, that is right.

9 Other thoughts? Regional, chauvinistic
10 claims? Joe?

11 MR. URAVITCH: We will also take a look at
12 costs, again.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

14 MR. URAVITCH: It has been a while since we
15 have looked at the cost to go to these various venues.
16 So, we will take that upon ourselves to update the
17 cost to go to these different places so we can see
18 what we can realistically afford.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: That is true. That is true.
20 Or you could drop ten members off the committee.

21 Okay, Lauren has a thought, whether it is the
22 last one, I don't know.

1 MS. WENZEL: Actually, this is on a different
2 subject than geography. I just wanted to thank all of
3 you for your willingness to go out and be ambassadors
4 and let people know about you work.

5 And I can send you all the kind of working
6 version of this PowerPoint that we talked about. I
7 think what I would like to do is take a look at it and
8 make sure it is updated from this meeting.

9 And I also just wanted to ask that if you do
10 all go out and have informal conversations, if you
11 could just let me know, just so we know kind of who
12 has been outreached, that would be great.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, Mark?

14 DR. HIXON: Just to follow up on that. So, it
15 is okay if we are asked by our state government or
16 something to give a briefing on what this committee is
17 doing, to do that with that PowerPoint? Is that true
18 or not?

19 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I think that is right.

20 DR. HIXON: Okay. I am not advertising.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Right. Okay. Any other
22 things that - that must be raised? I want to extend,

1 on behalf of all of us, an appreciation to the staff.

2 And I am reluctant to start naming them because I
3 will leave some off.

4 But somebody did call my attention to the
5 fact that I think, and I haven't looked at it, but the
6 list of the MPA committee, the FAC, I don't know that
7 it has the staff support listed there. And I wish
8 that it did. I know they switch, they move around,
9 but Bunny is here forever. And Dana is here forever.
10 And Heidi is here. And Lauren is here. And, you
11 know?

12 So, Joe and Lauren, can you do that for us so
13 that their names are on the record? We thank all of
14 them. Heidi particularly, unsung hero in the
15 background and Dana and Bunny particularly. You know,
16 you want to be good to Bunny, right. You know this.
17 So, that would be wonderful.

18 What else? Anything else? If not, can you
19 adjourn us, Lauren?

20 MS. WENZEL: Yes.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to thank all of you for
22 your hard work over these three days.

1 MS. WENZEL: Yes, thank you all.

2 (Applause.)

3 MS. WENZEL: We are adjourned.

4 (Whereupon, at 4:40 p.m., the meeting was
5 adjourned.)

6 * * * * *

7